DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 185 PS 011 758

TITLE	Review of Child Nutrition Programs. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Nutrition of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, United States Senate, Ninety-Sixth Congress, Second Session (April 15 and 17, 1980).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.
PUB DATE	Apr 80
NOTE	135p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Federal Government; Health; Hunger; *Legislation; *Lunch Programs; *Nutrition; *Nutrition Instruction

ABSTRACT

The Hearings presented in this publication review the current state of federal child nutrition programs. Much of the testimony focuses on (1) the Women Infants and Children (WIC) program, which serves exclusively low income, pregnant women, nursing mothers and their children; and (2) the Nutrition Education and Training (NET) program. Most witnesses before the Subcommittee on Nutrition spoke in favor of the approval of the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1980. Continuation and expansion of the school meal program were special concerns of many witnesses. Prepared statements addressed to the committee are appended. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194185

REVIEW OF CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

PS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NUTRITION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 15 AND 17, 1980

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

PS011758

63-218 O

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1980

OCT 28 1980

UU. 2

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, Kentucky
RICHARD B. STONE, Florida
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
EDWARD ZORINSKY, Nebraska
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
DONALD W. STEWART, Alabama
DAVID H. PRYOR, Arkansas
DAVID L. BOREN, Oklahoma

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
BOB DOLE, Kansas
S. I. HAYAKAWA, California
RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota
ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa

HENRY J. CASSO, *Staff Director*
CARL P. ROSE, *General Counsel*
GEORGE S. DUNLOP, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NUTRITION

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota, *Chairman*

PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
JOHN MELCHER, Montana

BOB DOLE, Kansas
JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
S. I. HAYAKAWA, California

CONTENTS

Page

McGovern, Hon. George, a U.S. Senator from South Dakota, opening statement. 1

Leahy, Hon. Patrick J., a U.S. Senator from Vermont 2

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Tuesday, April 15, 1980

Foreman, Hon. Carol T., Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, accompanied by George Braley, Margaret Glavin, and Robert Greenstein 3

Callahan, Dorothy, NET program coordinator, Bureau of Nutrition Education and School Food Services, State Department of Education, Boston, Mass 17

Everly, Glenn A., director of instruction, Taylor County Board of Education, Grafton, W. Va 20

Grandjean, Ann, associate director for education, Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc., Omaha, Nebr 23

Gebhardt, Dr. Dan, general practitioner, Hardin, Mont 28

Melton, Ora, chairperson, Perry County WIC participant advisory committee, Uniontown, Ala 30

Reed, Barbara, Children's Foundation WIC Advocacy Project, Atlanta, Ga 32

Canning, Susan, executive director, Del-Mar-Va Rural Ministries, Dover, Del., and Sue Hoechstetter, National Association of Farmworker Organizations ... 34

Fridy, Susan, director, Consumer and Nutrition Programs, Milk Producers Federation 39

Thursday, April 17, 1980

Wynn, Jane, legislative chairperson, American School Food Service Association, Fort Lauderdale, Fla 41

Scherer, Dr. Joseph, director of government relations, National Congress of Parents and Teachers 46

Bode, Barbara, president, The Children's Foundation 48

Sabatasso, Louis, president, Sabatasso's Pizza, Santa Anna, Calif 52

Goodman, Chip, vice president, Larry's Food Products, Gardenia, Calif 54

Ryersbach, Peter, director, Bread and Law Task Force, Montpelier, Vt 61

Carland, John, Kansas Child Nutrition Project, Kansas City, Kans 64

Lucas, Brenda, Head Start Mother, Baltimore, Md 67

Byrd, Gale, director, Arkansas Nutrition Project, Arkansas Community Action Agencies, Little Rock, Ark 69

Perry, Jeanne, chairperson, New York City Summer Food Program Coalition, and staff person, Community Council of Greater New York, New York, N.Y 76

Cimarosa, John, president, Association for Recreation Management, New York, N.Y 78

Polk, Ed, executive director, Children's Rights Group, San Francisco, Calif 79

APPENDIX

Foreman, Hon. Carol Tucker, Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, statement 83

Callahan, Dorothy L., R.D., State coordinator, nutrition education and training program, National NET liaison officer, Massachusetts Department of Education, Bureau of Nutrition Education and School Food Services, Boston, Mass., statement with attached appendixes 88

Everly, Glenn A., director of instruction, Taylor County Schools, Grafton, W. Va., statement 94

APPENDIX—Continued

Page
Grandjean, Ann C., M.S., R.D., associate director, Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc., Omaha, Nebr., statement 96
Gebhardt, Daniel J., M.D., Hardin, Mont., statement 100
Canning, Sue, executive director, Del-Mar-Va Rural Ministries, Dover, Del., and Sue Hoechstetter, National Association of Farmworker Organizations, statement 101
Fridy, Susan, director, consumer and nutrition programs, legislative representative, National Milk Producers Federation, statement 104
Bode, Barbara, president, the Children's Foundation, inserted position papers . 106
Sabatasso, Louis, president, Sabatasso's Pizza, Santa Ana, Calif., article submitted by: "Project SMILE Frowns on School Lunch Budget Cuts" 110
Goodman, Chip, vice president, Larry's Foods, Gardena, Calif., statistical table inserted by 111
Perry, Jeanne, chairperson, summer meals advisory council, New York City, N.Y., statement 112
Stewart, Kay, chairperson, summer meals advisory council, New York City, N.Y., statement 114
Tucker, Marion, CFN coordinator, Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Association, Inc., Raleigh, N.C., statement 116
Ullrich, Helen D., executive director, Society for Nutrition Education, Berkeley, Calif., letter dated April 17, 1980 to Senator Talmadge with attached statement 118
Low Income Planning Aid, Boston, Mass., letter dated April 25, 1980 to Senator McGovern 119
DiSalvo, Sheri, director, Food and Nutrition Services, Milpitas Unified School District, Milpitas, Calif., statement 119
Katayama, Vicky, Food Law Center, San Francisco, Calif., statement 121
White, L. Gene, director, office of child nutrition services, Department of Education, State of California, Sacramento, Calif., letter dated April 10, 1980 to Senator McGovern with attached statement of Amanda Dew Mellinger, coordinator, Nutrition Training and Education program, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, Calif 123
National Education Association, statement 126
Additional questions from Senator McGovern and USDA responses thereto 127

REVIEW OF CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1980

U.S. Senate,
Subcommittee on Nutrition of the
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 324, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. George McGovern (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators McGovern and Leahy.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE McGOVERN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH DAKOTA

Senator McGovern. The subcommittee today begins 2 days of hearings on the child nutrition programs. Four programs that come under the rubric of child nutrition programs—nutrition education and training, summer food service, State administrative expenses, and finally, the food service equipment assistance reserve—all expire at the end of this fiscal year.

The other programs have later expiration dates, or, in the case of the school lunch, school breakfast and child care, are permanently authorized. But all of these programs will be the subject of these hearings for oversight purposes, and, regrettably, for purposes of determining what cuts could be made that would not strike at the heart of these programs, and yet would help in the battle for a balanced budget in the fiscal year 1981.

Last year I introduced Senate bill 1898, a comprehensive redraft of the School Lunch and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. S. 1898 would integrate these two statutes into one, hopefully making them more readable and usable in the process. Although I believe consolidation is still a worthwhile goal, I regret that the need to focus on more pressing issues realistically forecloses the possibly of dealing adequately with S. 1898 prior to the May 15 deadline for reporting a bill from the committee.

Time constraints also prevent us from addressing at this hearing Senator Church's bill, S. 2388, on commodity letters of credit, but we will take up that bill at a later date.

A markup of this year's child nutrition legislation will follow soon after these hearings. It is my hope that Senator Talmadge, Senator Dole, and I and others, will join in introducing the bill shortly that will serve as the vehicle for the committee's markup of child nutrition legislation.

The administration bill, which the committee has issued as a committee print, and S. 605, Senator Bellmon's bill, which was the subject of hearings last year, will also be examined by the committee at that time.

Today, we will hear from Ms. Carol Foreman, representing the administration, from panels on nutrition education and training and the WIC program, and from a representative of the Milk Producers Federation.

At Thursday's hearing will be representatives from the American School Food Service Association, Project SMILE—School Meals Industry for Learning and Education—the National PTA and the Children's Foundation. Panels on the breakfast and summer programs are also on Thursday's agenda.

We have a rather ambitious schedule, but I think with the cooperation of all the witnesses in keeping their formal presentations as brief as possible, we will be able to hear from everyone.

Secretary Foreman, we will be pleased to begin with you.

Senator Leahy, did you have any opening statement?

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICK J. LEAHY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM VERMONT

Senator **Leahy**. If I might, just briefly, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment you in holding these hearings at the time of budgetary constraints. We seem, in some of the committees I serve on, to debate in broad generic terms whether a racetrack system for the MX will be somewhere between $40 billion, $125 billion, or something like that. Those are the specific figures, the ballpark figures come later. And that seems to be done without blinking an eyelash. And yet the nutrition programs, all of a sudden there is inordinate pressure placed on how we are going to balance the Federal budget from children and needy and those lacking nutrition.

I want to compliment your leadership in this for so many years. And I would just use one example in summary of just one of the many very good programs.

I held hearings in Vermont with Senator Bellmon under the auspices of your committee a few years ago. And a pediatrician, one of the better known pediatricians in Vermont, testified that for years, he had handled mostly malnutrition cases involving children in our State, involving everything from mental retardation, physical handicaps, based on malnourishment, both in pre- and postnatal times.

The whole point that he made is that Vermont, probably, is involved in WIC on a per capita basis more than just about any other State. Since the full implementation of the WIC program in Vermont, he has never had one single, not one single, case of a handicapped child or anything else related to nourishment. And before, he had a very significant—I forget the exact number—but a very significant amount.

I mention that because I rather expect that that example is repeated in State after State. It is mentioned, aside from the social good, which is a tremendous one, and one that morally, I think, we are all committed to. But if anybody wanted to put it on a slide rule, a dollar and cents basis, how many, many dollars down the road are saved of public moneys for the one dollar that might have been spent on just this one program.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to leave soon and go to another committee meeting. Ken Pierce from my staff will cover these hearings for me. But I do want to be actively involved and vote the markup afterward, in working with you on whatever you plan to do.

Senator McGovern. Thank you, Senator Leahy.

Secretary Foreman, we will be happy to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. CAROL T. FOREMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY GEORGE BRALEY, MARGARET GLAVIN, AND ROBERT GREENSTEIN

Secretary Foreman. Thank you, sir.[1] I would like to talk to you today and urge passage of our proposed legislation which we sent to you on March 10, and then revised by a letter of April 4. That letter on April 4 was part of the administration's effort to reduce the Federal budget deficit as part of an overall plan to fight inflation. And it has additional proposed reductions in a number of programs including food stamps, school lunch, summer feeding, and special milk. Those programs now constitute, for fiscal year 1981, a total reduction of $1.3 billion.

I would like, before Senator Leahy has to go, because he mentioned WIC, to deal first with the WIC program. It is amazingly cost effective. In our 1981 budget, it contains a substantial increase for the program, primarily because several recent studies have demonstrated the value of the WIC program. One study conducted at the Harvard School of Public Health in four WIC projects in Massachusetts found that the incidence of low-birth weight among infants whose mothers participated in the WIC program during the prenatal period was markedly less than among infants whose mothers, although eligible for the WIC program, did not participate.

The reduction in incidents of low-birth weight led to much lower hospitalization costs. The study estimated that each dollar spent in the prenatal components of the WIC program resulted in a $3 reduction in hospitalization costs, since the number of low-birth-weight infants who had to be hospitalized was significantly reduced.

And I brought with me today a chart that reflects the results of a study conducted by the Waterbury, Conn., Health Department in conjunction with the Yale Medical School where they found substantial reductions, as you will see, in infant mortality rates among WIC participants as opposed to mothers from similar groups who did not participate in the WIC program.

Although the benefits of this program are really well known, many counties across the country have no WIC program, and even where it is available, some women and infants who could benefit from participation are not able to participate because of restrictions on program development.

The increase that we propose in the fiscal year 1981 budget of $132 million would help to meet those needs.

---

[1] See p. 83 for the prepared statement of Ms. Foreman.

We are also proposing legislation to extend the WIC program authorization through 1983. We are not now asking the Congress to increase the WIC authorization ceiling for fiscal year 1981. The revised budget which was sent to the Congress last month requests $900 million for WIC in 1981 rather than the $946 million in the administration's January budget, $900 million is the current authorization ceiling.

If I may turn now to reimbursement for paid school lunches, we are again proposing to reduce that reimbursement by 5 cents for students from families who are not eligible for free and reduced price meals. Those are families of four with incomes in excess of over $15,800 a year. But there is one significant difference between this year's proposal and last year's. You know that, at the present time, these students represent 56 percent of all of the school lunches. Our new proposal will provide that if paid lunches ever fall to 50 percent or less of all school lunches in any school year, the 5-cent reduction would be automatically rescinded.

Our studies indicate that that 5-cent reduction would cause only about a 4-percent reduction in participation by paying students. The Congressional Budget Office agrees with our figures, and GAO has noted that they seemed to be based on reasonably conclusive analysis.

However, if we are wrong, then we would ask you to provide that the 5-cent reduction be automatically reinstated so that the program would not suffer ever from a larger reduction in participation by paid students.

I think it is important to talk about the level of support for all lunches under section 4. It is now 33.5 cents in cash and commodities. Under our proposal, the subsidy for these upper and middle income families would drop to 31.4 cents instead of increasing to 36.4 cents. There would be no decrease in per meal commodity support. In fact, I think it should be pointed out that we have decreased our commodity support for the school lunch program and will continue to do so.

The result of our proposal would likely be about a 5-cent increase in the charge to paying students. This means that middle and upper income families would have to pay about $9 more per year for lunches at school.

Although that hardly constitutes a major burden on any middle or upper income family, the aggregate savings are really quite substantial. They would represent savings of $158.2 million per year.

Now, if I may turn to the revisions in eligibility for free and reduced price meals. This proposal is unchanged from last year. Currently, the eligibility for free meals is 125 percent of the poverty line, while the reduced price eligibility limit is 195 percent of the poverty line. Our proposal will set the reduced price income level at 175 percent plus a standard deduction and set the free meal income limit at 100 percent plus a standard deduction.

The result is that the reduced price meal income limit will stand at about $15,000 instead of almost $16,000 a year, and the free meal income at $9,000 rather than $10,000. These modest adjustments provide a total savings of almost $200 million. Most of the savings come from lowering the free meal income limit. And it is important, I think, to note that all students who lose eligibility for free meals will qualify for reduced price meals instead.

I would like the committee to note, at this point, that the school lunch, school breakfast, and child care food program meal subsidies are currently indexed semiannually to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers. In concert with the Government-wide effort to reduce inflation, we are proposing that future adjustments to meal subsidies for these programs be made on an annual basis. An annual adjustment of the meal subsidies would be made each July 1 and would be applicable for the entire school year. An annual adjustment somewhat simplifies program administration by eliminating the midyear change in rates provided to schools and institutions. The elimination of the January 1 adjustment will save an estimated $75 million in fiscal year 1981.

We are also proposing legislation to strengthen the management of the summer food program. Of all of the FNS programs, this is the one within which we have had the most difficulty with waste, fraud, and abuse. We have had substantial success in reducing the problems in that program over the past 3 years, but we find that significant problems still remain.

We would like to deal with those by some amendments aimed at strengthening the management of the program. First, we are proposing to eliminate from participation from the summer program those large private sponsors which purchase meals from commercial food service management companies.

A second change would limit the number of meals served per day to two, lunch and either breakfast or a snack, except in those camps and programs serving migrant children.

The legislation also provides additional State adminstrative expense funds to assist States in the operation of the summer food service program.

Our legislative proposals for the summer feeding program would save about $45 million. Last year, the Department proposed to end the special milk program in schools that participate in the school lunch or breakfast program. That proposal would have saved over $140 million in next fiscal year.

Our proposal this year is somewhat different. It is a scaled down version. We would not eliminate the milk program from a single school, and would achieve a more modest savings of $55 million. The proposal would set the special milk subsidy at 5 cents per half pint in schools that also offer milk as part of the school lunch or breakfast program.

Currently, that subsidy for milk served to nonpoor children is 7¾ cents per half pint. And due to an automatic indexing, it is expected to rise to 8½ cents for the next school year. By reducing this subsidy to 5 cents, our proposal will simply require those children who do not buy the school lunch to pay a few pennies more for milk. The minimal impact on the dairy industry of this proposal should be more than offset by the growth in the WIC program.

In arriving at these decisions, careful consideration was given to both the health and economic impacts upon families involved. There is little question in our minds that the health and nutritional impacts of reaching more women and children in the WIC program are far in excess of those achieved by subsidizing middle and upper income school lunches at 36 cents per meal rather than at the 31 cents per lunch we are proposing, by subsidizing milk purchase by nonneedy students at 8½ cents rather than 5 cents, and by keeping the eligibility for free and reduced price meals at current levels that approach $16,000 a year.

I would like to say one word about direct Federal operation of these programs. Throughout the Nation, direct Federal operations of programs within a State is extremely rare. Most States spend most of their time complaining that Federal control usurps States rights. But in the case of child nutrition, the number of programs administered directly by the Secretary has increased steadily over the past few years. And I have a chart here that shows all of the States in which we operate directly through Federal employees one or more of the child nutrition programs.

We are proposing that the Secretary no longer administer the summer food service or child care program in any State. We would continue to have authority to operate the school food, special milk, and nutrition education programs in some places.

There are a number of reasons why this is necessary. As we have increased the management requirements for the summer program in order to improve service and reduce abuse, more and more States have turned the program back to the Secretary.

Last year California notified us in March that they were turning back the summer program for that year, and we had to undertake the massive job of implementing the second largest summer program in the country on 3 months notice. It is impossible for us to maintain program quality, accountability and controlled expansion when programs are not administered by the States where the children live and the sponsoring organizations are located, but by Federal regional offices often distant from the States involved.

The Federal staff available to conduct direct program operation is not large enough and, furthermore, we do not believe that direct Federal administration is an appropriate Federal role.

We will, therefore, propose that, in order to receive national school lunch funds under sections 4 and 11 of the National School Lunch Act, States shall assume administration of the summer food service and child care programs. The legislation emphasizes that the programs need not be administered by the State education agency, but that States should choose the proper focus of responsibility for those programs within the overall context of the States health, education, social, and recreational services to children.

Finally, I would like to point out that we are proposing that the nutrition education and training program be extended for 3 years. We believe that that program can provide children with better learning opportunities regarding food and nutrition, and are currently conducting a multiyear evaluation of the program to determine its strengths and weaknesses and how it can be made more effective. We believe that that authorization ought to be extended.

Mr. Chairman, before I close here, I would like to take 1 minute to comment on some actions that have taken place with regard to feeding programs since the beginning of this year.

Originally, the Department of Agriculture submitted to the Congress about $266 million in savings, legislative savings, to the food stamp program in fiscal year 1981. You, the Senate Agriculture Committee, when you made your recommendations to the Senate Budget Committee, recommended that there be $400 million in cuts in the food stamp program. Subsequently, the Department of Agriculture submitted additional cuts to the committee, cuts totaling about $430 million, so that we have now proposed over $600 million in cuts in the food stamp program for fiscal year 1981 at a time when food prices and inflation and unemployment continue to increase.

I was shocked last week when the Senate—week before last when the Senate Budget Committee went on beyond the cuts that you have recommended and the cuts that we have recommended, and has suggested to the Senate $1.4 billion in cuts in the food stamp program. Those cuts that they have recommended include one that was rejected here in the committee which would reduce food stamp benefits to families whose children participate in the free school lunch program, and, in addition, would reduce food stamp benefits for families getting emergency energy assistance.

I cannot help but question the rationale that allows the Senate Budget Committee to suggest such enormous cuts in the program at the same time that food prices and unemployment are clearly increasing. I think that we obviously are running into a situation where we have a severe threat of making very, very substantial benefit cuts to food stamp recipients. I point out to you that the proposals that we sent up in April will cut 500,000 people off the food stamp roles. To go beyond that, either reducing more people—eliminating more people from the rolls or reducing benefits substantially at this particular period of time strikes me as a Draconian action against the Nation's poor.

Senator McGOVERN. Well, thank you very much, Ms. Foreman. In your prepared statement, you have estimated that food price and inflation, alone, account for over $1.3 billion in the FNS budget. Now, you also state on that same opening page that you are recommending savings totaling $1.3 billion. So, in a sense, what we have here, if I understand this, is just kind of a washout. In other words, the cost of the program, because of inflation, has increased by $1.3 billion, but instead of taking that into account, you are reducing the program by that amount. Do I interpret it correctly?

Secretary FOREMAN. That is correct, Senator. We have tried to do that in a way that will not strike at benefits for the very low-income people in a way that will not cause people to go hungry. But it is true that we have those kinds of savings in the program.

Senator McGOVERN. I agree with your observation about the Senate Budget Committee resolution. That is an obscene resolution. I have no intention of supporting it. What makes it all the worse is that they have not only cut by $1.4 billion the food stamp program, but they have gone way beyond what the President recommended on the military side. The President had a very healthy increase in his budget to not only take account of inflation, but to add on a number of items above and beyond what it would have cost to keep pace with inflation. And the Budget Committee, not content with that, added on billions more, above and beyond the increase recommended by the President.

It is very clear to me where the money is going, from the cuts that they have made in the food assistance programs and in job training. What the Budget Committee has done, in effect, is to sell out to the Pentagon, and to make ordinary people pay the cost. Everything else that has to do with the well-being of ordinary people gets chopped. And then these military programs, including the MX program that Senator Leahy mentioned, is fully funded.

So I do not see how anyone that believes in government—that it is in the interest of the ordinary citizen—can support what the Budget Committee has done. It is bad enough trying to support what the administration has done, let alone support the Budget Committee's manipulations on top of an already distorted budget submitted by the administration.

On a more specific note, Ms. Foreman, why did the administration propose the nickel cut in the paid lunch reimbursement and the changes in the eligibility requirements rather than an across-the-board cut in sections 4 and 11, or some other type of across-the-board cut? I know you went into this somewhat in your statement. But I wonder if you could just enlarge on the rationale for that.

Secretary **Foreman**. Yes, sir. Let me make a general statement about it, and then ask Mr. Greenstein to fill you in on some of the details. Incidentally, I should have introduced my colleagues, and I am sorry. You know Bob Greenstein, the Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service; Margaret Glavin is the Deputy Administrator for the Special Nutrition programs; and George Braley is Acting Director for Policy, Planning, and Evaluation.

Our suggestion tried to pinpoint those places where we thought that we could make reductions and, therefore, assist in cutting the Federal budget this year without causing people to go hungry, without raising the risk of the inadequate nutrition. For those reasons, we suggested a nickel cut in the payment to middle and upper income students, feeling that, certainly, no one would go hungry; that only about 4 percent would drop out of the program as a result of that; that many of those would go into the a la carte line each day; and that, even if the students did not drop out of the program, the increased cost of the lunch would be 5 cents, or if they did drop out, that they would be likely to bring a bag lunch from home.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I must tell you that, since I prepare the food at our house, I think I can speak with authority in saying the school lunch program, even at a nickel more for middle-income families, is a very substantial bargain in these days of food price inflation. I do not think that it is possible for a mother to prepare a lunch anywhere near the nutritional quality of that provided in the school lunch program for the price that is charged for that program. We think that no one will go hungry.

When we first made this suggestion, we had a number of people from the child nutrition community suggest to us that they were afraid, not so much of this nickel cut, but of what might follow, that there might be additional cuts that would, in fact, undermine the participation of the middle-income students in the school lunch program. And it was in response to their express concern that caused us to put into this year's legislation the provision that says if the participation ever drops below 50 percent, the nickel cut would be reinstated.

So we have responded to the professed concerns of the child nutrition community on this score. In reducing the eligibility for free and reduced price meals, once again, we attempted to make sure that no one would go without adequate nutrition. Those students who drop from eligibility for a free lunch would automatically be eligible for the reduced price lunch which is only, generally, 10 cents per meal. And we think that the impact there on nutritional well-being is likely to be very small.

At the same time, we increased the funding for the WIC program because there we know that we are dealing with those people who are most in need at a time in their lives when good nutrition is absolutely crucial. And so we have tried, once again, to make all of our cuts and our increases work toward assuring adequate nutrition.

Mr. **Greenstein**. I think there are a couple of points, Senator, that I would like to point out. The once a year rather than twice-a-year adjustment, which is now part of the administration's package, I think it should be understood that that really is a percentage cut, and that it hits much more heavily in section 11 than in section 4.

Well, let us suppose you do not do an increase in the middle of the year that would otherwise be 5 percent—5 percent of the section 4 payment is less than 1 cent—5 percent of the section 11 payment is several cents, and is much higher. What that means is that the annual adjustment, itself, already hits low-income school districts, those with the largest percentage of free or reduced price children, far more heavily than a middle income or wealthier school district, say, in Montgomery County, Md.

If the committee were to add on top of that, doing an across-the-board adjustment in section 11, rather than the nickel cut in section 4, you would be penalizing, even far more severely, the low-income school districts and the poor children and not making much of an impact at all on the middle-income school districts.

In the low-income school districts where most of the meals are served free or at a reduced price, they can increase the charge to the child. They often cannot get anymore local revenue. A lot of those are cities which are already, some of the most severely hit areas in the new budget cuts that we have just been talking about. And the only way that they may be able to deal with these kinds of cuts in section 11, if you did an across-the-board cut, is by cutting the quality of the lunch.

I think our general sense would be that the very priorities that you, I think, feel, and we feel, are mistaken, and the Senate Budget Committee's resolution would be the same kind of mistaken priorities that would be reflected in not doing a section 4 cut for paying students, and spreading some of those budget cuts to middle and upper income areas than, instead, doing a percentage cut on section 11 payments and penalizing most heavily the poorest areas in the country.

Senator **McGovern**. Well, there is no question in my mind that, if we accept the figures that the Department has given, that inflation has increased the cost of these various programs by $1.3 billion, and you are going to reduce the overall nutrition budget by $1.3 billion, that is just another way of saying that the lowest income people across the board, and also those who are benefitting from the nutritional program who may be in the middle class, that they are going to pay that inflationary cost.

And the problem with that is that people who are getting food assistance are not only experiencing inflated food prices, but everything else they buy is inflated. So as they make those hard choices about what they are going to cut, obviously, they are going to have less left over for food and for other things. They are going to have to trim on the expenditures for clothing, medical care, and transportation, matters of that kind. And on top of that, they take what amounts to a $1.3 billion cut in this food budget. I think it comes exactly at the wrong time. I realize what you are trying to do is to make a contribution from the Department of Agriculture toward the overall objective of balancing the Federal budget. It just outrages me, though, that, time after time, this is always done at the expense of the ordinary person, particularly those at the lower end of the income scale. And, somehow, we let the Russians decide how we are going to set our budget priorities.

I have never understood this logic that if Russia wants to deprive its consumers of a decent life in order to put all this money that it does into military operations, I think that is more of a threat to them than to us. And I do not see why we make the same budget mistakes here. It is a kind of a mirror image of the bad values that they have that leads us into this situation.

I have got a number of specific questions, some of which I will submit in writing, Ms. Foreman. I do not see any point in brow beating you for budget decisions that have to be complied with by the Department.

But there is one question I wanted to point out in terms of the WIC program. Anything that might alter the perceived health benefits of WIC, and you, yourself, have pointed out in your charts, could prove detrimental to the program. And in that context, the Department has proposed lowering the WIC standard for iron fortified cereals from 40 percent of the required daily allowance to 25 percent. Now, what I would like to do is send you some written questions about that decision and other related decisions that we think may have the potential of reducing the health benefits to the program. We will send those on over in writing, and then, perhaps, you can respond to them.

Secretary FOREMAN. Yes, sir. If I could just respond 1 minute on that subject, and we would be glad to respond in detail when we receive your questions.

It is important to note that the WIC program is one that is conducted under a physician's care; that it is a prescription package of food. And if the physician feels that it is important for the WIC participant to continue to have that high iron cereal, then he has the option of continuing to prescribe the high iron cereal. It is only in those cases where he feels that it is not necessary that we would drop down to the 25 percent RDA for iron in the WIC cereal component.

I know that we will have your support in opposing those further cuts suggested by the Senate Budget Committee, Senator McGovern. And we do appreciate your support.

Although we would all like not to have any cuts in nutrition programs—it is important to note that our cuts in the child nutrition program go primarily to those children from middle and upper income families, and not to lower income families, and that we do have an increase in the WIC program which serves exclusively low income, pregnant women, nursing mothers, and their children.

It is those across-the-board types of cuts and the kinds of cuts suggested by the Senate Budget Committee particularly which would reduce the food stamp benefits to families who have poor children participating in the free lunch program that we think are the most frightening in terms of undermining the Nation's nutritional status.

And I think, in addition to the points you made about people having to cut back on other things that they purchase as a result of not having this nutritional assistance, I think that we have to anticipate that there will be health repercussions in the long run in cutting back on the good nutrition provided by these programs.

Senator McGOVERN. Well, that, of course, is the point that concerns me. There is not any doubt in my mind that, in the long run, when we cut these programs too much we actually lose money to the public in the sense that we weaken the health of the Nation. We actually weaken the defense of the country.

There are so many things we could do to make this country stronger and healthier and more secure that somehow we pass up because of this mistaken notion that the only way to build national defense is building more weapons systems. We seem to be going down that road more this year than at any time I can recall since I have been here in the Senate.

I think it is a great mistake and, in the long run, it is going to weaken the country and make us more vulnerable. That plays into the hands of people who do not wish us well, but that seems to be the course we are bent upon. I do not blame you or your colleagues here today for that. It is decisions that are apparently made elsewhere. And as you, yourselves, have said, the Senate Budget Committee is making it all the worse.

Well, thank you very much for your testimony, Ms. Foreman. We will have some additional questions to submit.

Secretary FOREMAN. Thank you, sir.

[Subsequent to the hearing on April 15, questions were submitted to USDA; the questions and answers follow. See additional questions and answers on p. 129.]

Question. Why did the Administration propose the nickel cut in the paid lunch reimbursement and changes in the eligibility requirements rather than an across-the-board cut in Section 4 and 11 or some other type of across-the-board cut?

Answer. In considering various options for cost savings in the Food and Nutrition Service programs our major objective was to protect benefits for program participants that are most in need of assistance.

One change that we have proposed would cause about a 5-cent increase in prices charged for school lunches served to students from middle and upper income families. For example, students from families of four with incomes over $15,310 would have to pay 5 cents more for their lunch at school each day. During a 180-day school year, this amounts to only $9 if the student buys a lunch every day. Even under this proposal, meals served to students from middle and upper income families would still receive a Federal subsidy of about 31 cents each day or $56 during a 180 day school year. Nine dollars extra a year to receive $56 in Federal support is still quite a bargain and should not be a hardship for most families. This provision will save $156.3 million.

The second change, a modest reduction in the income eligibility standards, would leave the benefit of receiving free meals intact for all students from families below about 112 percent of the poverty line. Students from families between 112 percent and 125 percent of poverty would now pay a nominal charge for their school lunches, in most cases 10 cents per day, rather than receiving their meals free. The only other students affected by this change are those from families between about 187 percent and 195 percent of poverty. These students would now pay the "full price" for their meals rather than receiving them at a reduced price. In the case of a family of four, these students are from families with incomes between $15,310 and $15,990. It should be noted that they would still be eligible to receive lunches that are Federally subsidized, though to a lesser extent. This change will save $195.8 million. We feel that both of these changes are quite modest and will not seriously harm the programs.

An across the board reduction in section 4 would place an undesirable burden on poor schools. While all lunches would receive fewer cents, schools serving more free and reduced price lunches would find it hardest to make up the difference since the program operating funds accruing from the service of free and reduced price lunches is fixed except for State and local contributions. Those schools serving mostly paying children would have the option of increasing the charge to children thereby recouping the loss in Federal subsidy. This option is either prohibitive or non-existent in schools serving mostly free and reduced price lunches since the per meal increase on paying children would have to be much greater than the Federal reduction to cover free and reduced price lunches for which there is no charge and consequently no increase possible. Such poor schools would be faced with either finding increased State and local contributions (which would be extremely difficult in many large cities) or reducing the quality of the lunches being served.

A percentage decrease across the board to Sections 4 and 11 would be even more harsh. A 10 percent reduction on Section 4 would be 1.8 cents (10 percent × 17.75=1.77 or 1.8) while a 10 percent reduction on Section 11 free lunches would be 7.9 cents (10 percent × 79.5=7.9). The problem of making up this reduction in income would be the same as under an across the board reduction in Section 4 except that it would be even more severe.

Question. Are there are correlations between the percent of paying children in a program and the economic health of the program? If so, do these vary by region of the country, by urban versus rural, by big city versus small city?

Answer. There is no scientific data that correlates the percent of paying students with the economic health of a school lunch program. However, there are numerous examples of economically healthy programs that cater primarily to students from low income families receiving free and reduced price meals as well as those that serve mostly students from higher income families who pay full price for their meals. From our experience, it appears that the economic health of a program depends primarily on how well a particular program is managed rather than the clientele that it serves.

Question. What exactly is current law on State match?

Answer. Section 7 of the National School Lunch Act, implemented by Section 210.6 of the program regulations, requires each State to match each dollar of Section 4 general cash-for-food assistance expended by it during the current school year for lunches served, other than free or at a reduced price, with $3 (decreased by the percentage difference if the State's per capita income is less than the National per capita income) of funds from sources within the States. It further requires that for each school year, State revenues (other than those derived from the program) appropriated or specifically utilized for program purposes (other than State-level salaries and administrative expenses) shall constitute at least 10 percent of an amount determined by multiplying $3 (or a lower matching requirement based on the State's per capita income), times the total dollars of Section 4 assistance funds expended by the State in the preceding school year for paid, reduced price, and free lunches.

The text of Section 7 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, is presented below for reference:

"Section 7 Funds appropriated to carry out section 4 or 5 during any fiscal year shall be available for payment to the States for disbursement by State educational agencies, in accordance with such agreements, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as may be entered into by the Secretary and such State educational agencies, for the purpose of assisting schools of the States in supplying (1) agricultural commodities and other foods for consumption by children and (2) food service equipment assistance in furtherance of the school lunch program authorized under this Act. Such payments to any State in any fiscal year * * * shall be made upon condition that each dollar thereof will be matched during such year * * * from sources within the State determined by the Secretary to have been expended in connection with the school lunch program under this Act. * * *; and for any fiscal or school year (after 1955) * * *, such payments shall be made upon condition that each dollar will so be matched by $3. In the case of any State whose per capita income is less than the per capita income of the United States, the matching required for any fiscal school year shall be decreased by the percentage which the State per capita income is below the per capita income of the United States. For the purpose of determining whether the matching requirements of this section and section 10, respectively, have been met, the reasonable value of donated services, supplies, facilities, and equipment as certified, respectively, by the State educational agency and in case of schools receiving funds pursuant to section 10, by such schools (but not the cost or value of land, of the acquisition, construction, or alteration of buildings, of commodities donated by the Secretary, or of Federal contributions), may be regarded as funds from sources within the State expended in connection with the school lunch program.

"For the school year beginning in 1976, State revenue (other than revenues derived from the program) appropriated or used specifically for program purposes (other than salaries and administrative expenses at the State, as distinguished from local level) shall constitute at least 8 percent of the matching requirement for the preceding school year, or at the discretion of the Secretary, fiscal year, and for each school year thereafter, at least 10 percent of the matching requirement for the preceding school year.

"The State revenues made available pursuant to the preceding sentences shall be disbursed to schools, to the extent the State deems practicable, in such manner that each school receives the same proportionate share of such revenues as it receives of the funds apportioned to the State for the same year under sections 4 and 11 of the National School Lunch Act and sections 4 and 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The requirement in this section that each dollar of Federal assistance be matched by $3 from sources within the State (with adjustments for the per capita income of the State) shall not be applicable with respect to the payments made to participating schools under section 4 of this Act for free and reduced price lunches: *Provided*, That the foregoing provision shall not affect the level of State matching required by the sixth sentence of this section. The Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the amounts to be paid to any State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Secretary the amounts so certified."

Question. As Federal reimbursements have increased over the last decade, has the State commitment kept pace as a percentage of total expenditures?

Answer. According to available data[1], we find that the State contribution for program support has indeed kept pace with the increase in Federal reimbursement payments. We compared the Federal payments, as well as the State contribution, to the total expenditures. This comparison is shown in the attached table. While the Federal and State contributions have more than doubled over the period from 1972 to 1977, the amount of Federal support has historically been about 6 times that of the State contribution.

FEDERAL AND STATE CONTRIBUTIONS

Year	Total expenditures for NSLP	Federal contribution (sec. 4 plus 11)	Federal contribution as percent of total	State revenue match (SRM) provided	SRM as percent of total
1972	$2,357,928,342	$738,764,153	31.33	$121,107,435	5.14
1973	2,679,704,935	882,162,039	32.92	140,691,393	5.25
1974	2,999,108,617	1,087,539,547	36.26	180,071,870	6.00
1975	3,490,283,083	1,289,018,320	36.93	226,901,528	6.50
1976	3,639,436,780	1,481,047,258	40.69	252,639,144	6.94
1977	[1]3,719,564,557	[2]11,688,082,236	45.38	[3]267,635,745	7.19

[1] This is a 57.75-percent increase over 1972 expenditures.

[2] This is a 128-percent increase over 1972 contributions.

[3] This is a 121-percent increase over matching provided in 1972.

---

[1] Public Law 95-166 established that State matching shall be on a school year basis, rather than fiscal year. To implement the provision, the period October 1, 1977, through June 30, 1979, was designated as a transition phase. For this reason, data for school year 1978 and 1979 are not available yet.

Question. How much additional State contribution would there be if we required the States to match for Section 11 as is done for Section 4?

Answer. The amount of Section 11 funds expended by all States in fiscal year 1979 was approximately 1.90 times that of funds for Section 4. Thus, if the matching requirement were applied for Section 11 in the same manner as it is for Section 4, the additional State requirement would be about 1.90 times the contribution for Section 4. In fiscal year 1981 the projected amount of the State revenue required to meet the matching requirement for Section 4 for all States is approximately $200 million. If there were a requirement that Section 11 funds be matched as well, the additional amount would be approximately $380 million. Thus, the total State Revenue Matching amount for both Section 4 and 11 would be about $580 million.

Since Section 11 funds are dependent on free and reduced price (F/RP) meals, a State which has high rates of F/RP meal participation would have its matching requirement increase at a rate considerably higher than the rate for the national average. That is, a matching requirement on Section 11 funds would create a financial demand proportionately greater in States with high rates of free and reduced price meals participation.

There are two additional points to consider. First, some States have traditionally expended more of their funds for the Programs than has been required. If the amount of the required match were raised, those States may still be able to meet it without actually increasing their contribution. That is, the requirement might grow, but the total amount of State funds provided to the Program might not.

Second, there is no requirement that matching funds go to support any particular type of meal service—such as free and reduced price lunches. Therefore, it there were a matching requirement based on Section 11, there would be no way to ensure those State funds, contributed based on free and reduced meals served, do not go to support paid meals.

Question. What improvements in management has the Congress mandated or the Department initiated in the past few years and how effective have these changes been in curbing the major abuses?

Answer. Over the past few years both Congress and the Department have initiated major changes in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) in order to improve Program Management.

Public Law 95-166, enacted in November 1977, mandated several important changes in the Program. The law increased State administrative expense funding to allow for the expansion of administrative staffs. The Department is now also required to publish regulations and handbooks by certain deadlines to allow States more time for their pre-Program planning and training. The application approval process has been strengthened by Public Law 95-166. Potential Program sponsors are required to demonstrate that they have adequate administrative and financial responsibility to manage an effective food service and that they have not been seriously deficient in their operation of the Program in the past. Applicants are also required to submit a complete budget for their administrative costs to the State administering agency with the Program application. Public Law 95-166 also strengthened the eligibility requirements for vendors participating in the Program. A vendor is required to be registered in its State if it wishes to participate in the Program. States may deny this registration if a company lacks the administrative and financial capacity to perform or has been seriously deficient in the past. In addition, the law gave the Department the authority to strengthen its bidding and contracting procedures. This law also mandated more stringent controls on the payment of advances to sponsors. The regulations placed a limit on the amount of money that may be advanced and sponsors must complete training for their staff before a second advance will be issued. Finally, penalties for fraud are specified in the law and regulations.

The Department has outlined minimum monitoring and review requirements for both the State administering agencies and sponsors. States must now visit certain types of vendors, sponsors, and sites before the Program begins to ensure that they are capable of offering the planned meal service. Once the Program begins, States must review sponsors and sites according to specified quotas and time frames. Regulations also require that sponsors visit and review their sites during the initial weeks of the Program's operations to ensure that problems are identified and corrected in a timely manner. Additionally, the Department has strengthened the Program audit requirements. If sponsors receive more than $50,000 in Program funds, they must be audited each year. Audits are required of other sponsors every 2 years, except in special cases. The Department has developed guidance for these audits to ensure that they provide necessary Program information.

After a pilot program in 1979, the Department has decided to allow States to use statistical monitoring if they feel that it would be helpful in identifying sponsor problems and mismanagement. The Department has specified the circumstances under which these methods would be most helpful to the States. The recognition of further problems in Program management led to the establishment of more restrictive eligibility criteria for sponsors in Public Law 96–108. These criteria restrict the eligibility of large, vended programs. Congress and the Department believed that fraud and abuse in the SFSP occurred most frequently in these large vended programs. We feel that all of these changes, both legislative and regulatory, have improved SFSP management significantly.

Question. What indications do you have that even with the additional outreach efforts mandated in the Administration's bill, many children particularly in the larger cities, will not be deprived of the opportunity to participate in the Summer Feeding Program by limiting the number of sites and children that private sponsors may serve?

Answer. The Department believes that the Administration's proposed legislation would not deny Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) benefits to a significant number of children. The size limitation on privately vended programs is intended to eliminate the larger sponsors which have been most prone to fraud, waste, and abuse. We estimate that nearly 70 percent of privately vended sponsors would be unaffected and about 17 percent would reduce the size of their operation. Only about 14 percent of the private sponsors using private vendors would drop out.

There is evidence, moreover, suggesting that vigorous outreach efforts can result in public sponsors picking up children who might otherwise be affected by the withdrawal of large private sponsors. In New York City, for example, FNS has made a concerted effort to increase participation by public sponsors, and the city's board of education has responded by expanding its role in the SFSP.

Question. To what do you attribute the desire of a large number of States to turn back administraton of these programs to the Federal government?

Answer. There are some basic reasons why State agencies desire to turn back administration of the Child Care Food Program and Summer Food Service Program to the Federal government. The law and new regulations governing the Child Care Food Program have increased the management requirements for the administration of the program by State agencies. Provisions mandating start-up and advance payments to institutions and the choice of reimbursement methods available to institutions, coupled with required training and monitoring activity, are cause for concern on the part of State agencies that currently administer the CCFP. These increased responsibilities, particularly the monitoring requirements, are necessary to correct deficiencies found by GAO and OIG in recent audits. Expanded management requirements for the Summer Food Service Program (initiated to improve services and reduce program abuses) also increase the responsibility of State agencies.

As the responsibilities associated with administering the CCFP and SFSP grow, philosophical reservations held by State education agencies toward administering non-technical programs become more visible. In light of these facts, the Department has increased administrative funding over the years to States operating the SFSP and the CCFP. Additional discretionary funds have been made available this year to help defray the cost arising out of the increased administrative responsibilities associated with the implementation of the CCFP regulations. However, as long as States can choose to avoid the problems associated with the Administration of any program, with the knowledge that such refusal will not stop the receipt of program benefits in the state, we will continue to experience program turn backs.

Question. Are there any actions the Congress or the Department could take to make it more palatable for the States to run the programs short of the punitive measures the Administration is proposing?

Answer. The Department's proposed legislation provides additional State Administrative Expense Funds to assist States in the operation of the SFSP. These funds would include a basic grant of $30,000, separate funding for the conduct of audits and additional funds provided by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis to large State agencies when the need for such funding is justified.

Public Law 95–627 increased State Administrative Expense Funding for the CCFP, and FNS has provided 2 percent funds for the conduct of audits of participating institutions. In addition, $30,000 in additional basic grants has been made available to State agencies to promote improvement of their administration of the program. This is in addition to monies earned under the SAE formula.

Nevertheless, States continue to turn back these programs to FNS. It is apparent that as long as a State can turn back the programs when difficult administrative problems or State resource problems develop, some States will choose to give up the program in spite of such enticements as increased funding.

Question. What would be the effect on the program if Congress were simply to mandate that the States must run the summer and child care programs?

Answer. It is crucial that responsibility for administration of the Programs be held by all States. Maintenance of Program quality, accounting, and controlled growth cannot be ensured where Federal regional offices, often distant from the States involved, must stretch their staffs to complete the tasks of administering these Programs.

Currently, regional offices administer the Summer Program in 21 States, and beginning May 1, will administer the Child Care Food Program in 14 States. In some regions the administrative burdens are becoming overwhelming, and the cost of Federal administration is generally much greater than State administration would be. The Department believes that a statutory change could effectively require States to administer both Programs. The proposed amendment would tie eligibility for cash assistance payments in the School Lunch Program to operation of both Summer and Child Care Programs.

If legislation were enacted simply prohibiting States from turning back the Child Care and Summer Programs to USDA, but not also linking these Programs to eligibility for the School Programs, some States might decline to administer Child Care and/or Summer. These Programs might not be offered by all States; however, we estimate that very few States would fail to administer the programs.

Question. Has the Department thoroughly analyzed the response from health providers to the proposed lowering of the WIC standard for iron fortified cereals from 45 percent of the USRDA to 25 percent, and what position have they taken with respect to this change?

Answer. The Department has proposed a level of 45 percent of the USRDA for iron for cereals issued to iron deficient participants and a level of 25 percent of the USRDA for iron for cereals provided to other participants. Of the 1,074 comment letters received by the Department on all aspects of the food package proposal, approximately 700 letters addressed the iron issue. One-hundred eighty of these comments expressed support of the cereal iron proposal and 520 expressed opposition.

The commenters categorized as health providers are primarily those from State and local agencies, and few from various other segments of the public. The letters from State and local agencies were from Program Coordinators and Directors as well as nutritionists and other staff members.

Out of the total of 700 commenters addressing the cereal iron issue, about 426 opinions can be readily attributed to physicians, nurses and nutritionists, as follows:

Support:		Oppose:	
Physicians	2	Physicians	31
Nurses	19	Nurses	50
Nutritionists	58	Nutritionists	266
Total	79	Total	347

The most prevelant reason for opposing the proposal was the difficulty and confusion involved in administering two iron levels. The commenters cited problems in administering two separate iron requirements in the areas of voucher issuance, program monitoring, and vendor training and monitoring. They said it would be difficult to ensure that iron deficient participants would purchase or consume cereals with a 45 percent USRDA iron requirement, especially in a family with an iron deficient WIC participant and a non-iron deficient WIC participant.

A substantial number of commenters also expressed their opinion that lowering the iron requirement would be contrary to the WIC Program's goal as a preventive health program. Some commented that iron deficiency is a major nutritional problem among the WIC Program's target population. Others expressed concern that lowering the iron requirement for non-iron deficient participants would not help those who are borderline cases.

About one-half of the commenters who expressed opposition to the cereal iron proposal recommended the retention of the current iron level of 45 percent of the USRDA for iron for all cereals authorized. It is important to emphasize here, however, that the proposal's strongest opposition addressed the administrative aspects rather than medical reasons (218 to 107). About one-third of those opposed to the cereal iron proposal recommended an iron level of 25 percent of the USRDA. Again, this recommendation was a result of administrative concerns as well as medical considerations. A few others recommended one iron level only and did not specify which iron percentage they preferred.

Out of the 181 comments expressing support of the cereal iron proposal, the most frequently cited reason was the need for more cereal variety, because the current cereals are not acceptable to participants. The commenters also made additional recommendations. Some said the cereal industry should be encouraged to provide more cereals with 45 percent of the USRDA for iron. Others expressed the opinion that cereals should not be treated as a therapeutic device and that iron deficient persons should be treated with iron supplements.

A few commenters addressed the issue of bioavailability of iron also. They recommended further research into the bioavailability of iron in cereals and the role that iron plays in improving the hemoglobin and hematocrit measures of participants. They were concerned about the poor or questionable bioavailability of iron in cereals.

Senator McGOVERN. All right. We are going to call the nutrition education and training panel now, and hold the WIC panel for a little later. The nutrition education and training panel includes Ms. Dorothy Callahan, Mr. Glenn Everly, and Miss Ann Grandjean.

And Ms. Callahan, we will proceed with you and your colleagues.

STATEMENT OF DOROTHY CALLAHAN, NET PROGRAM COORDINATOR, BUREAU OF NUTRITION EDUCATION AND SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Ms. CALLAHAN. I am Dorothy Callahan, the State coordinator for the NET program in Massachusetts. I am also the national NET liaison person representing all NET coordinators in the country. I am here today asking, of course, for your support of this program and for adequate funding.

I do have a personal interest in the legislation. I was a member of the original task force that you invited to Washington to discuss possible legislation and make recommendations about nutrition education in schools. I am a registered dietitian and a certified health educator, so I know the need for the program. I have been a State nutrition education specialist for 10 years and a multiple school food service director for 15 years, so I know that the child nutrition programs are an ideal vehicle for teaching nutrition education.

You do have my written testimony, which I respectfully request be entered into the records. This morning, rather than read it, I will give you a few of the highlights.[1] I was also asked to bring a few slides to show what is happening. If we have time, I would like to go through the slides.

I do want you to know that during the past week and a half I have talked with or have had information from over 100 people, or had information from over 100 people throughout the country concerning this testimony. These people represent at least 90 agencies and they support what I am to say today.

I have been asked to address my remarks today to how NET programs impact on school food service programs. The committee believes that there is adequate testimony concerning classroom activities. The people with whom I spoke agree that NET impacts on food service programs in at least five major ways.

First of all, we are training school food service personnel. For some States, the NET money meant that they could do indepth training for the first time. Other States were able to expand training programs. Some of the ways that this is happening are through correspondence courses; self-instructional packages; workshops; and onsite training in schools, in central kitchens, or in portable kitchens that travel throughout the State.

---

[1] See p. 88 for the prepared statement of Ms. Callahan.

Second, we feel that NET is helping to improve the self-esteem of the school food service personnel and the image of the cafeteria. We believe that the school food service personnel needs to know that they are part of the educational team, and that the cafeteria is more than just a place to feed the child. It is also a place in which to learn.

We are doing this by cooperating with American School Food Service and American Dietetic Association, certification and continuing education programs.

It is being accomplished through team workshops. This is a high priority. We feel that if school food service people are in class with teachers or administrators, they talk together and they have a better feeling of coordination. We are working with students through youth advisory councils; we are working with parents and with parent advisory councils; we are working to get our message out to the community through TV and through radio talk shows.

We have many, many articles in newspapers, and we also send newsletters to personnel to disseminate the activities of the NET program.

Our third objective is to improve the cafeteria environment. A few years ago, Massachusetts took a survey of 80,000 public school children. Some of their complaints about the cafeteria were that there was too much noise, too much confusion, no place to sit, no time to eat, too long to wait in line, and difficulty in carrying trays.

The NET program is promoting family-style feeding in cafeterias. This is where the teachers and the principals eat with the children at the table; parents are volunteering; and older students are helping younger students.

NET is also promoting changes in recess scheduling. For example, recess before lunch so that the children are not rushing through the meal to get out to play; or, a quiet time after lunch, for reading or art work. With these changes, there is increased participation, less waste, and fewer upset stomachs in the afternoon.

NET is also improving the cafeteria environment with educational messages on bulletin boards or wall murals, so that the children learn while they are eating in the cafeteria. We also try to make the cafeteria more attractive, painting, wall murals, and so forth.

The fourth way in which NET programs are working in school cafeterias is to improve menu quality. Today, I am going to stay with the objective of increasing vegetable consumption. Those of you who are familiar with school food service know that vegetables constitute most of the waste arriving at the dishroom window. We are having a national effort to promote salad bars, not only in the high schools, but also with child care and up through the elementary and secondary school levels.

I had one school food service director tell me that as soon as a salad bar was installed in his school, there was a 15-percent increase in participation, and that 80 percent of the children selected the vegetable from the salad bar as part of their meal pattern against 20 percent choosing the hot vegetable. Refuse went down to only 1 or 2 inches compared to half to three quarters of a barrel before these salad bars.

The fifth way that NET is impacting upon school food service programs is by making the cafeteria a learning laboratory. We have cooking lessons in the classrooms followed by actual cooking in the cafeteria. We conduct tours of the cafeteria and the kitchen. We cooperate with students conducting acceptance surveys, with menu suggestion panels, tasting parties, food fairs, and even school gardens. We actually have school gardens, outside and in greenhouses where the children grow the food and then it is served in the cafeteria.

So I am asking you, does NET make a difference? We feel that it does. California showed that, after the NET program there was a 15-percent improvement in food choices in the cafeteria and a 26-percent decrease in plate waste. Similar results were reported from Nebraska and West Virginia.

The Council of Chief State Officers is endorsing this program, saying that in the school lunch program children begin to learn good nutrition by practice and by adding nutrition education it helps the children to generalize these good habits into their personal lives.

I would like to show some slides that highlight the activities I have been talking about.

We told you we were training food service personnel through workshops; through onsite training in schools; onsite training in central kitchens; onsite training in a portable kitchen. After skill training in the morning, there is classroom instruction in the afternoon.

We told you that we were trying to raise personnel self-esteem and cafeteria image by promoting professional growth through ASFSA and ADA programs; through team workships with teachers, and administrators. Here we see a principal and a school food service supervisor working together. We have parent tours through the cafeteria to help them to understand the school food service program. We have our advisory councils working to improve the school food service programs. We send out newsletters to students, to teachers, to parents, to the community.

We are trying to enhance the cafeteria environment, making it a more pleasant place in which to eat. We have family-style feeding; parents helping; older students helping the younger students; the quiet time after lunch—actually reading on the stage of the cafeteria; educational hangings made by the students to decorate the walls; "What's for breakfast?"; "Try it, you will like it"; Nutrition Booth, "Eat to learn, learn to eat," a booth actually set up where the children ask questions as they go through the cafeteria line; a decorated serving line; "How many servings?"; "We are magnificent," a wall mural; and here is an actual painting on the wall by art students to make the cafeteria a little more interesting and attractive.

We told you we are improving menu quality; with the salad bars at the preschool; at the elementary school level; at the junior high school level; and at the senior high school level. We are promoting a learning lab; preschoolers learning about cooking in the classroom then helping the school food service director in the kitchen; fifth graders touring the kitchen; sixth graders touring the storeroom.

Here we have the elementary school children preparing a half-acre vegetable garden, with the crop to be used in school food service.

Senior high school students helping with salad preparation; students conducting plate assessments; conducting food acceptance surveys; weighing the waste with a teacher; cafeteria taste testing; letter writing an initation to take a friend to lunch; a food fair that involves the cafeteria with industry; serving Greek food in the cafeteria while students learn about Greece in the classroom.

And this is the proof, to "Are NET activities successful?" Compare these "before" and "after" graphs of lunch participation. And, then, I ask you again, "Does NET impact on food service programs?" I think you will agree that it does.

In closing, I want to read just one statement. On behalf of all State coordinators and other interested individuals and groups who have talked or written to me during the past week, I ask that Senator McGovern and the committee consider the reauthorization of section 19 under Public Law 95-166 as originally enacted. The flexibility of this law is desirable since each State has its own nutrition needs and priorities. And as we grow, successful programs will be disseminated and replicated.

I also ask that there be adequate funding of this legislation. This is a difficult request in view of the plan for a balanced budget, but it is essential if we are to realize full value from the money already expended.

I have added an appendix to the testimony which shows the cash flow of NET funds through a State which I would like to have you read. I have also added a bibliography of all the people and agencies who have participated in my testimony. In closing, I want to express my sincere appreciation for being invited to present this testimony and for your past support of the NET program.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you, Ms. Callahan, and those supporting materials will be made a part of the record.

STATEMENT OF GLENN A. EVERLY, DIRECTOR OF INSTRUCTION, TAYLOR COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, GRAFTON, W. VA.

Mr. EVERLY. Senator McGovern, my name is Glenn Everly, and I am the director of instructional programs for the Taylor County Board of Education in Grafton, W. Va.[1] I was asked to come here today and speak to you about the effect that the NET program is having on the schools in West Virginia, at least the ones that it has touched to date.

Last Thursday I was contacted to appear before this committee. Very quickly, I began contacting administrators that I am familiar with around the State, whom I knew had the NET program in those schools. Additionally, we have the NET program in two of our schools in the county, and I would like to share with you some of the comments that I received from those administrators.

---

[1] See p. 94 for the prepared statement of Mr. Everly.

Our largest school in the county is a school of about 798 students. The principal there is Dan Mankins. He indicated that about 85 percent of his staff of about 50 professional employees and about 20 paraprofessional employees were involved in the NET training program last year. This included not only the classroom teachers, but art, music, physical education, special education, and the sort. And all of the people who participated last year are now actively involved in nutrition activities within their classroom environments.

The parents have gotten involved with the program as a result of the training that took place last year. Parents are now invited to come in and participate with the program. Five parents—different parents each month—are invited to meet with the head cook, teachers, students. They devise menus for that particular month.

The completed menus are then sent home with each of the 798 students so that all parents are aware of what is to be served. Special menus are encouraged from classrooms and each grade level is invited to submit a menu each month.

My 6-year-old daughter is with me today, and she was recently involved with some of menu planning. The school had a Vietnamese child that arrived from Indochina and was placed in her classroom. In honor of that child and to make her feel more welcome at the school, the class devised a special menu for her.

All nonfood value items have been eliminated from the snack sales in the school. As a former principal at that school, we sold about $50 worth of snacks each day to the students following lunch. When I was there we sold candies and pastries, and other nonnutritional items. All of those items have now been eliminated from that snack food sales. The school is currently selling juices and fresh fruits. When the principal first made that change, he anticipated that his sales would fall off drastically, however, it has continued at about the same level. Money is still available from the sale of nutritious snacks for the principal to purchase necessary office supplies.

One of the more interesting things the principal is going to do next year relates to the food items that are solicited from parents for classroom parties. Traditionally, party days at school included the serving of Kool Aid and cookies or cupcakes. But, again, through the particpation of parent groups, the school has devised a nutritious snacks list that will be sent home to all of those parents who donate party foods. And they are to provide only those items which are on that list.

The cooks have been included in the nutrition training program. That has resulted in, I think, a more effective program. When I was still principal we had conducted some nutrition training, however, we overlooked the need to involve our cooks. Because we have included them this time, we are now seeing less salts, sugars, and starches in the school menus. The cooks are inviting students into the kitchen, and cooks are going to the classrooms.

Most importantly, the participation in the school food service program is up, and the plate waste is down. During March of 1980, 91 percent of the students ate school lunch at the Anna Jarvis School, and 55 percent of the youngsters participated in the school breakfast program.

We do not have statistical data about plate waste, and I was at a little bit of a loss to come up with something to prove to you that it is down. I asked Dan Mankins to "give me something that I can share with the committee." He related that "the best I can do is that there is gentleman who comes in, a local farmer, and picks up all the plate waste each day. He takes it home and then cooks it to feed to his pigs." He indicated that the fellow is complaining because he is not getting as much plate waste as he used to get.

One of the other schools in the county, the Flemington Elementary School, reported to me that, subsequent to the completion of the nutrition training program, they have observed an increased frequency of classroom activities relating to nutrition education. The materials, which will be shared with you in a few minutes, are provided to Taylor County School by our State Department. They have been very enthusiastically received by both students and staff. Children are now willing to try foods that they would not previously try. Parents have indicated that they note improvement in their children's awareness in the home about food groups as they relate to meal balancing.

Finally, school food service personnel in that school is also of the opinion that less food is being wasted.

I contacted two elementary principals in Wood County, W. Va., and they have indicated that they are taking a total school and community approach to nutritional education. Food service personnel and parents visit the classroom to assist with nutrition instruction and menu planning. Teachers are encouraging students to eat at school. Parents, grandparents, and school board members have been invited to the school to share school lunch. The schoolchildren have developed a "Good Nutrition" exhibit and have displayed it at the local shopping mall. Some parents report that they are now allowing their children to help with the food selection and menu planning in the home.

I also contacted a secondary principal to see if there were things that really were happening in the secondary schools. He indicated to me that two members of his staff attended a NET training program conducted at West Virginia University during the summer of 1979. As soon as they completed that training, they returned to the school and immediately starting working with the coaches and the athletic staff to include good nutrition as part of the local football program there.

They also got the community involved and the community agreed to donate the foods for the fall football practice session. Athletes were instilled with the idea of a need for a balanced diet, and school food service personnel donated their time and were assisted by players and coaches in menu planning. Nutritious foods were substituted for the traditional pop and candy during the morning and afternoon breaks in the football practice sessions.

At the beginning of the school term, moneys were obtained from the county and school funds to purchase nutrition education instructional materials for inclusion in the school curriculum. I point out that there are local dollars, as well as the State and Federal dollars that are being spent, because we feel this is a worthwhile activity.

The other changes in the secondary school were very similar to those that I have already shared in the elementary school setting, and I will not speak to those further.

I want to say, in summary, that it is pretty clearly evident that the NET program has achieved success in West Virginia schools. And I can personally attest that the NET program has allowed nutrition education to assume its rightful place among the instructional program in Taylor County.

However, there are some things that still need to be done. The West Virginia State Department of Education has trained 33 cadre members throughout the State made up of elementary teachers and principals. To date they have conducted training programs in 30 of the State's 55 counties. If we are going to reach the other 25 counties with this program, we do need continued funding.

There are 64 child care sponsors in West Virginia. Better than half of those sponsors have been trained, or individuals from the centers have been trained. If we are going to reach the other half, we have got to receive some continued funding.

The State department staff, this summer, with existing money is planning two seminars, one at West Virginia University and the other at Marshall University. There will be two athletic coaches invited from each county to participate in a program entitled "Nutrition and the Athlete." This is pretty important to West Virginia at this point in that we had two athletes who died last summer during football practice from dehydration. Hopefully we can help to see that further occurrences do not happen again.

If we want to continue similar programs, we also need your support.

I feel that I have summarized the beginning of a good nutrition education program in West Virginia. However there is a great deal to be done, and we need your support.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you, very much, Mr. Everly, for your testimony.

Our final witness is Ms. Ann Grandjean.[1]

STATEMENT OF ANN GRANDJEAN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR EDUCATION, SWANSON CENTER FOR NUTRITION, INC., OMAHA, NEBR.

Ms. GRANDJEAN. I am Ann Grandjean. I am associate director of the Swanson Center for Nutrition, Omaha, Nebr. I am responsible for nutrition education programs for the center. I am honored to have been invited here today to testify about a program that I feel is very important to America's children.

I have been asked to testify regarding the collaboration of the public and private sectors in the NET program. It is often thought that the private and public sectors are polarized; I attest they are not.

The Swanson Center for Nutrition is a nonprofit, tax exempt, private operating foundation. The center and Experience Education have been working with the Nebraska NET program to meet the nutrition education needs. Experience Education, formerly Southwest Iowa Learning Resource Center, Red Oak, Iowa, is also a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization.

---

[1] See p. 96 for the prepared statement of Ms. Grandjean.

A nutrition education program capable of addressing all the identified needs, requires the involvement of many people with expertise in various areas. It is unlikely to find any one organization, public or private, that can supply personnel with expertise in all the necessary areas. By combining funds and personnel from the public and private sectors we have been able to meet many of the identified needs. Any large program has several factors that must be considered; specifically, funding, time, and capabilities.

Footing the total bill for a comprehensive program is difficult for any one organization, and I personally believe, undesirable. The Nebraska NET funds in our situation, served as the nucleus for the program that was developed. However, the other two organizations did contribute both hard cash and inkind match for the program. This joint funding, I feel, was one of the factors that contributed to all of the organizations, and people involved, having a vested interest in not only the development of the program, but the continuation of the program.

As I mentioned, time and capabilities are also important factors. To exemplify this, I would like to allude to the portion of the Nebraska program that resulted in the development of lunchroom and classroom activities and materials. I think this portion of the program is an excellent example of how the merger worked.

The lunchroom and classroom program developed is entitled "Experience Nutrition," and consists of 11 packages. I have brought one package as an example of what we mean by a package. This program was pilot tested in Nebraska last year. This year it is being utilized and evaluated in Washington, D.C., West Virginia, New Orleans, Colorado, Nebraska, Boston, Iowa, and Kansas. As you can see, this involves a diversity of locations.

To accomplish this, several things were necessary. First it was necessary to produce 5,500 packages and the thousands of materials included in them. This involved printing around the clock, 24 hours, three shifts, for a number of months. This particular feat, we found, was more easily accomplished by the private sector. It was also necessary to train the personnel to be involved. We conducted workshops for food service personnel, principals, and teachers. We conducted 20 workshops in 20 different locations in a matter of 2 months. We utilized personnel from all three organizations to conduct the workshops. However, without the NET coordinators in the specific locations to coordinate and schedule, it would have been virtually impossible.

The pretesting and posttesting is also a feat. We gathered pretest data from 16 locations in a matter of a few weeks. Expertise from the private sector in the area of educational evaluation was invaluable. But, again, without the NET coordinators, it would have been totally impossible to have accomplished such a large scale evaluation.

It is not possible for me to share with you in a matter of 5 minutes all the ways the public and private sectors in Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and other States have worked together, but I do hope that I have given you a few examples of how the public and private sector have joined forces, and with NET funds acting as the nucleus, have produced a successful program.

Thank you for inviting me to testify.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you, Ms. Grandjean, for your testimony.

I would like to direct a couple of questions to all of you, and any one of the three of you or all can respond as you see fit.

Last February the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture joined together in the releasing of a new pamphlet called "Dietary Guidelines for Americans." It actually followed, somewhat, the dietary guidelines put out by this committee a couple of years ago.

I am wondering if you are aware of any efforts to incorporate the principles outlined in the guidelines into the training of school lunch workers.

Ms. CALLAHAN. Could I answer that?

Senator McGOVERN. Ms. Callahan?

Ms. CALLAHAN. In the first place, we are very unhappy because they did not arrive at our particular destination. I talked to Audrey just last night and she promises that we will have thousands of them to use in Massachusetts. One of the priorities in Massachusetts is the U.S. Dietary Guidelines. This was decided by Adelphi questionnaire to nutritionists. U.S. Dietary Guidelines came top on the list. And we want to have every school food service director to have a copy of that booklet.

Senator McGOVERN. I think it is an excellent booklet.

Ms. CALLAHAN. Oh, it is terrific, and it is great to see the two departments together coming out with something that really—we feel it is excellent.

And, as I say, our minigrants going out in Massachusetts this year have the U.S. Dietary Guildlines, and they will be addressed by 32 minigrants coming with 1980 moneys.

Ms. GRANDJEAN. I am very unhappy that the pamphlet was not available earlier. One of the unique features of our packages is that they contain the software the teachers need. The needs assessment, revealed that teachers do not have adequate preparation time and like self-contained units. We also tried to include materials that had already been developed so as not to reproduce efforts when good materials were available. Had the booklets been available, we would have included them.

Senator McGOVERN. And have you received them now?

Ms. GRANDJEAN. I do have them now, and I feel very confident that they will be included in Nebraska's program in the future.

Senator McGOVERN. Have you received that report?

Mr. EVERLY. I have not received it yet, no, sir. The State department of education may have them, and they may be passing them down to us. But they have not arrived yet.

Senator McGOVERN. Well, I really hope the two departments are going to make an effort to get that in circulation because it is an excellent dietary guidebook. And it is brief and concise and well done, well illustrated, and easily understood. It is as good as anything of that kind that I am aware of.

Are any of you aware of any action on the part of the Department of Agriculture to make it easier for the dietary guidelines to be used in upgrading the quality of school meals? Are they, in addition to making available a printed booklet, are they doing other things that you are aware of that are of assistance in upgrading the quality of school lunches?

Ms. GRANDJEAN. I can only speak for Nebraska, but the Nebraska NET coordinator, as part of her total NET plan, conducts workshops for the food service supervisors and other food service personnel. She is also revising the curriculum for certification in the State, and developing materials to be used in inservice sessions. Through these methods, the quality of lunch will improve as will the children's acceptance.

Senator McGOVERN. We know that the funds are very modest for nutritional education and training. Do you folks have any feeling, if we had to make a choice between using those broadly to cover as many people as we can, students in the classroom, people in the community, or the option of concentrating all of the funds simply on improving the capabilities of the school lunch people, the ones that are running the program, where would you put the money? Ms. Callahan?

Ms. CALLAHAN. I think it has to be a joint effort. I do not think, unless we get the cafeteria and the classrooms working together, we are really going to succeed. I have been in food service since 1953, and I have been in the State department of education since 1970, and we have had nutrition education going on in Massachusetts since 1970. It was not until NET funds became available that we were really recognized by the academia. I think that nutrition education has to be a combination of classroom and cafeteria, or otherwise the cafeteria becomes just a feeding station that school administration looks upon as a necessary nuisance.

Senator McGOVERN. It has got to get into the classroom——

Ms. CALLAHAN. It has got to be both.

Senator McGOVERN [continuing]. And across the board in terms of the personnel that are involved.

Ms. CALLAHAN. It has got to be across the board.

Senator McGOVERN. Do you feel that way, Mr. Everly?

Mr. EVERLY. Yes. I can speak, I think, pretty specifically that—again, when I was an elementary principal, we had a nutrition training program in 1973 or 1974. We did not include food service personnel. We just included teachers at that time.

We did some things in the classroom, but I do not think it had nearly the impact that the training program that has just been completed has had on the same school because it was a total school effort where all teachers and all food service personnel were involved. That has, I think, made everybody feel better about what has happened, and there has been more of an impact.

Senator McGOVERN. I take it that you feel the same, Ms. Grandjean?

Ms. GRANDJEAN. Yes, I agree. I feel that, without a doubt, one of the strongest points of the NET program is the coordination of lunchroom and classroom. You cannot conduct nutrition education only in the classroom or the lunchroom and expect to change eating patterns. Patterns that are influenced by so many factors.

Ms. CALLAHAN. Could I make one more statement?

Senator McGOVERN. Surely.

Ms. CALLAHAN. I just wanted to point out that I do not think our commissioner or people in the State department of education realized what a wonderful vehicle nutrition is to teach basic skills until the NET program became available. They are finding now that kids really learn if nutrition is tied to the basic skills of reading, writing, the performing arts. We are doing this in Massachusetts and I think that it is most helpful.

Senator McGOVERN. Ms. Callahan, I recognize that you have been in this matter of food service a long time. You say since 1953.

Ms. CALLAHAN. 1953, I started as a food service director in a multiple school system.

Senator McGOVERN. Just in summary, what do you see as the principal problems encountered by food service personnel, what prevents them from preparing more nutritious and more appetizing meals?

You have made reference to some of the gains that have been made. Why can't that be done across the board?

Ms. CALLAHAN. Well, school food service people have to be on two sides of the fence. They have to be aware of cost effectiveness, running their programs in the black, and at the same time, try to serve more nutritious foods.

Budgetary contraints is a critical problem in serving more nutritious meals. We may want fruit served more often for dessert, but if the budget must be considered, and if a pan of cake costs 80 cents compared to $8 for apples, the choice is obvious.

And I shudder when I think that 5 cents may be pulled back from each lunch, and that the escalator clause may be implemented only once a year. These can only be detrimental to serving more nutritious and appetizing meals.

Senator McGOVERN. Do you have any ideas other than more funding what would provide more vigorous efforts to provide training for managers and workers in the school food service field?

Ms. CALLAHAN. You know, funding is the key to training.

Senator McGOVERN. That is the key.

Ms. CALLAHAN. "Funding" is the key word. Funding is necessary to provide materials for training—and even to entice personnel to attend workshops. Food service personnel cannot attend training sessions during the regular work day unless substitutes are provided. Contracts often require payment for meetings after the regular work hours are completed. Therefore, it becomes necessary to pay expenses, even, to get them to go.

So funding, I would say, is necessary.

Senator McGOVERN. Mr. Everly, you have been a school administrator. How do you feel the program could be improved? How could we get greater interest and support from local, county, and State educational administrators?

You seem to be vitally involved. Is that typical of other administrators?

Mr. EVERLY. I think that administrators, particularly at the school level, are very much aware of the need for nutrition education programs within their building, and I personally think that the parents are also interested. By getting to the parents through PTO, PTA's, and other parent groups. Also, I feel that rather than changes coming from the top down, from the State superintendent down through the local schools, I think through this program we see things happening from the school level, the grassroots, up. I perceive nutrition education becoming a part of our statewide curriculum very, very quickly in West Virginia because of what's happening with these funds.

I do not anticipate that there is going to be nearly the expenditure needed in the future that we have had to have at the beginning to ensure that this comes about.

Senator McGOVERN. Ms. Grandjean, the States are required to establish State advisory councils that are supposed to give advice on program planning and implementation within each State.

Can you tell us how that system has worked in Nebraska and how do you relate to the advisory council?

Ms. GRANDJEAN. I personally have not worked with the advisory council. My involvement with the NET program has been in the area of evaluation. However, the advisory council in Nebraska consists of educators from various areas: parents, teachers, representatives from other agencies, and so forth.

The advisory council did review the needs assessment and helped direct the State NET coordinator in the development of the program. They meet routinely and advise on various aspects.

I might add that a spinoff of the advisory council that was not anticipated has been the involvement of additional State agencies or departments. As an example, the materials that were developed are now being reviewed by the school for the deaf, the school for the blind, and special education agencies in the Nebraska Department of Education for possible adaptations. This was a spinoff from the advisory council. The NET program has been a far-reaching program.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony.

Our final panel today is on the WIC program, women, infants, and children feeding program. Dr. Dan Gebhardt, Mrs. Ora Melton, Ms. Barbara Reed, Ms. Sue Canning, and Ms. Sue Hoechstetter.

The American School Food Service Association, I understand, will also be submitting written testimony on the nutrition education and training panel.

Dr. Gebhardt, you may proceed for the panel. If you can summarize your statements it will help and we will see that those of you that have prepared statements that the entire statement is made part of the record. Dr. Gebhardt.[1]

STATEMENT OF DR. DAN GEBHARDT, GENERAL PRACTITIONER, HARDIN, MONT.

Dr. GEBHARDT. Thank you. My name is Dan Gebhardt. I am a general practitioner in practice in the rural southestern Montana. I have been there for approximately 10 years and speak to you with the qualifications in that I do see WIC participants, infants, children and women who are pregnant on a very routine and regular basis.

I spent 1 year in southeastern Montana as a medical officer on the northern Cheyenne Indian reservation and the remaining 9 years in the practice in Hardin, Mont.

I was in this area practicing prior to the initiation or the onset of the WIC program and was able to see the changes that have taken place over the years since its initiation. A number of the changes or observations, rather, that I have made as a physician practicing in a rural area where WIC is active are as follows:

---

[1] See p. 100 for the prepared statement of Dr. Gebhardt.

I noticed a considerable inadequacy of the education on nutrition, particularly for obstetric patients, and this resulted in a number of serious medical complications in pregnancy such as excessive weight gain or in many cases inadequate weight gain.

I also noticed a high incidence of anemia and a very low incidence of breast feeding in general. I also noticed a very high incidence of toxemia of pregnancy which is probably one of the greatest complications which we who deal in obstetrics have to deal with in pregnancy.

And I can say quite frankly that there has been a considerable decrease in the incidence of preeclampsia or toxemia due to the onset of the WIC program. I noticed poor growth patterns in children. We plot growth patterns, and I have done this for many years, and there have been very poor growth patterns. There has been marked anemia in the children resulting in a very high incidence of other diseases as a consequence of anemia such as chronic otitis media or inner ear infection. There is definitely a correlation between the incidence of otitis media and anemia in children.

Also I noticed an inadequate referral for the proper childhood immunization. An example that I might share with you really exemplifies what my findings have been prior to WIC. I can very clearly recall about 4 years ago late one evening I was called to the hospital to render care to an indigent 24-year-old woman who was at term of pregnancy and who had received no prenatal care whatsoever.

She was anemic. She was toxemic, had gained approximately 45 pounds weight. She was new to the area and also WIC was new to this area. She delivered twins with the complication postdelivery of severe toxemia and had grandmal seizures and nearly expired.

The children were of low birth weight, were anemic as was the mother. They subsequently received the adequate medical care and ultimately did OK. But 2 years later after referral to WIC by this lady and her family, she returned to my office on referral from WIC as a new ob patient.

She again was about 3 months pregnant and had received the proper diet counseling. She had received adequate supplementation of her diet such as adequate calcium intake for normal breast feeding. She had been advised as to the benefits of breast feeding and had intentions of doing so which she was unable to do in her first pregnancy.

Her children were referred to me for the necessary immunizations and their anemia was treated appropriately. She showed no signs of toxemia during this pregnancy because of the counseling that she had received on diet. She was well prepared, and as I noted, was prepared for breast feeding.

This, to me, was really a drastic change in a short period of time, and is only one of many, many examples of the improvements that people have had health carewise with the onset of WIC.

In conclusion, I feel that as a practicing physician who sees WIC participants that the education on nutrition has improved dramatically, and the nutritional status of those who are in need has also improved dramatically.

I think that although there are not good studies to verify this that there has been a reduced health cost by virtue of the fact that we are preventing numerous diseases or disease processes.

And I think personally I am grateful for WIC and what it does for my area because I am practicing in a rural area, and because it is medically deprived, it has really reduced my workload as well.

Thank you.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you, Dr. Gebhardt.

Mrs. Melton, the chairperson of the Perry County WIC Participant Advisory Committee, Uniontown, Ala.

STATEMENT OF ORA MELTON, CHAIRPERSON, PERRY COUNTY WIC PARTICIPANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, UNIONTOWN, ALA.

Mrs. MELTON. I am Ora Melton from Perry County WIC Advisory Council. In Perry County, we have a WIC staff which we have for a short time, which we have a nurse, Mr. Rickey Calhoun. He has worked overtime trying to help those that come in.

Now, we are cut short of funds. We are being cut back on the people who are on the WIC program. We used to get a gallon and a quart of milk. We have been cut off the quart. We have been cut off a pound of cheese. We are cut off a dozen eggs. The new born babies are cut off the juice which they used to get 15 bottles of juice. They are cut off the cereals. They only get the SMA milk on which even the doctor put them on it, 31 cans a month.

So now they're saying no funds. They're going to cut the milk down, and I suggested to the nurse, if the milk were cut down to 25, give some cereal and some juice where they would have the vitamin C.

And we have had problems that the people did not know about the WIC program. And since the advisory council got started, we did have success in getting more stores opened to operate the WIC voucher. We did not have but three stores that were taking the vouchers, the other didn't know about the program.

Our nurse did not have time to go out and do what he needed to do about opening the stores. Now, they say we do not have enough funds to keep the stores to serve the few people because over half will be taken off the program. We have a lot of children and expectant mothers now that are at nutritional risk bad, and they are being turned down.

We have reached the caseload since the advisory council got into action. We need to raise the caseload in Perry County because in some of the counties they have only 87 participants, and they have a nutrition problem there, they have a nurse, they have the clerk and they have the secretary. In Perry County, we have only a nurse, only a secretary. And the nurse gives us the nutritional guidance that he can.

And I was in there one day. I have three children on the WIC program. I had one born premature which I did not know about the WIC program. Luckily enough, he weighed enough not to be put in an incubator to stay.

Then when I was on WIC with the last baby, he was born early, but by being on the WIC program, he weighed enough so that he didn't have to stay in the hospital, because if he had stayed in there, I do not know how we would have got the bill paid.

And so an example of showing our nurse, we was in there one day. He told my little girl, he said, "I want you to drink milk, not coke." And she said OK, she nodded her head OK.

So one day I asked my daughter for a half a glass of coke. She said, "What did that nurse tell you mama?" I said, "The nurse didn't tell me anything." She said, "Yes, he did. He told you to drink milk, not coke." One day she forgot and asked for a little coke, I said, "What did the nurse tell you?" She said, "The nurse told me to drink milk, and I will drink the milk."

And when she and the little boy sit down, I let them know where this is coming from before they eat. You know, that they are getting help and showing that we need help. So they say their grace and they eat their food and they're doing better.

OK. The little girl goes to nursery school, well, Head Start school, she had dropped back a little bit when the nurse gave her the next check up. The little boy who was premature, he moved up, but he's underweight, but he moved up.

So I still have to give them vitamins along with the WIC program we receive. There are a lot of kids that need this who are not getting it, and those that are getting it, they are doing better.

And we pleading to you and to all, please continue this program for us, and we want to add vegetables and peanut butter to the program. There is a lot of parents that learn that dried beans and dried peas carry a lot of protein, just as much meat, and I didn't know that myself until I started with the WIC program.

And we have a lot of people that still do not know. We have expectant mothers of several months trying to get on. We have one expectant mother. She went and signed up. She did not get on. Her baby was born. Six weeks later the baby died. Then she got on it for 6 months, but it was too late for her baby. And she was on the WIC advisory council, and that disturbed her and she had a nervous problem and all because, see, she lost her child.

And since the babies are so small, when they are born, if they get the nutrition they need, it would help them to learn in school, to study more. We may have more doctors because they can learn. If I had known what I known with my first child which I was lucky that he did not have this problem, he would be in better shape than he is now, which is pretty good. And now more babies are being born anemic than before, and that is why this helped. My last child was not as anemic as the first two before I knew about this program.

So we in Perry County and Alabama, we appreciate the help we had and we really will appreciate the help we will get, and we hope that you will not discontinue this.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Melton, for your testimony.

Ms. Barbara Reed of the Children's Foundation, WIC Advocacy Project, Atlanta, Ga.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA REED, CHILDREN'S FOUNDATION WIC ADVOCACY PROJECT, ATLANTA, GA.

Ms. **Reed**. My name is Barbara Reed. As a member of the Children's Foundation WIC Advocacy Staff, I have spent the last 3½ years monitoring the implementation of the WIC program in the Southeast and working with both community groups and State and local health providers in support of their efforts to initiate and expand and improve local WIC programs.

It is on the basis of these experiences that I would like to offer my comments today. I do not want to take the time here to elaborate on all the statistics and indexes of health status that by themselves I think mandate increased WIC funding.

Suffice it to say that we in the Southeast have particular reason to be concerned about this issue. In our region, one out of every four children lives in a family whose income falls below the Federal poverty level.

And the 10-State nutrition survey and other research clearly establishes that where people are poorest they are most likely to suffer from the health problems associated with undernutrition.

According to a recent study conducted by the Southern Growth Policies Board and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, if you are a southern baby, you have 17.8 chances in a thousand of dying before your first birthday. If you are a southern black baby, your chances are worse, 27.9 per thousand.

Tragically part of this waste of human potentially could be avoided. My own experience and the experiences I have had with nutritionists all over the South have convinced me that the WIC program is working and working well in my region.

At the end of February, the program was serving 440,872 women and children. Unfortunately, however, for every southern woman and every southern child who received WIC there are four women and children who desperately need these benefits and cannot get them. Because of funding limitations, they cannot be enrolled.

Kentucky and Alabama, for example, have just initiated frozen caseloads. Eighteen of Georgia's twenty local WIC projects now have waiting lists.

These numbers statistically prove the need for expanded WIC. But I think we too often talk in statistical terms about unmet needs. Let me try to humanize this discussion, by giving you one example, of the tragedy that can happen when WIC funds—enough WIC funds are not available.

A woman 6 months pregnant with twins, and a high risk patient of the M. & I. project at Grady Hospital in Atlanta, was examined by the WIC nutritionist there. The nutritionist discovered that the patient's weight gain was abnormally low. The reason became all too evident when the patient described her circumstances: an unemployed husband whose benefits had run out, her own low-paid, erratic, piecework job, two children, no AFDC benefits since intact families are ineligible for AFDC in Georgia. Food stamp benefits alone could not provide adequate food. The woman was hungry. The unborn babies were virtually starving. WIC foods could have made all the difference but funding limitations meant that these foods were not available to this woman. For the last 2 months the nutritionist's own personal money and some limited church money may have saved these babies. These funds also may be too little too late. The woman was hospitalized with an episode of premature labor in her seventh month. She has since had to stop work, and the successful outcome of this pregnancy is still in doubt.

In this case, besides the human cost consideration, a small investment of WIC dollars could have saved a large hospital expenditure. This case also provides a strong argument for maintaining the present level of food stamp benefits. Without food stamps, the food resources of this entire family would be totally inadequate, and the children, as well as their mother, would have been at severe nutritional risk.

This woman is not a statistic, and neither are the 190,000 women and children in Georgia for which there is no funding for WIC benefits.

The need for WIC expansion is not just a southern phenomena. Women and children throughout the country are currently being denied access to this vital program because of limited funding. There are still over 700 counties without WIC. Unfortunately, even in those communities where the WIC program operates, not every nutritionally at-risk mother and child is being served.

At the beginning of this year, our WIC staff determined what percentage of each States need could be met during 1980. We found that 38 of the 49 States operating WIC serve only up to 30 percent of their total need. Consequently, we were delighted to learn of the administration's initital 1981 funding request and the Agriculture Committee's endorsement of that figure. We understand that $946 million would allow for the normal annual rate of growth and would enable the program to reach the same number of additional women and children next year as have been reached during each of the past several years.

We were very concerned, when the administration reduced its figure to $900 million, and we were deeply troubled when we learned that the Senate Budget Committee cut almost $100 million from the WIC budget for 1981. I cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of at least $900 million as currently called for by the administration and included in the print before the committee this morning.

There is a second comment I would like to make with reference to the committee print. USDA has proposed that the WIC program and the commodity supplemental food program not be allowed to exist in the same community unless both programs were approved to operate prior to the passage of the 1980 amendments. The Children's Foundation is opposed to this provision. In some communities, there may be populations for whom the commodity food package is more relevant than the WIC food package. For example, over the past several months I have been told by community leaders in Miami that there is a need to initiate a commodity program to serve a sector of Miami's population. We believe that all communities ought to have the option to serve their high-risk population by utilizing both supplemental nutrition programs, just Detroit, San Francisco, and Omaha are currently able to do.

I understand the District of Columbia's Department of Human Services is applying for a WIC program which they hope to run in conjunction with their commodity program. While USDA's provision will probably not effect the District, the United Planning Organization of Washington and the Inter Faith Conference of Metropolitan Washington asked me to voice their opposition to this provision.

In closing, let me say that I hope the Senate Agriculture Committee will help ensure that Congress provide at least $900 million for WIC in 1981, and maintains current food stamp benefits so that the WIC program can remain a supplemental program. Thank you very much.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you for your testimony, Ms. Reed.

Our next witness is Ms. Sue Canning, executive director of Del-Mar-Va Rural Ministries, Dover, Del.[1]

STATEMENT OF SUSAN CANNING, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEL-MAR-VA RURAL MINISTRIES, DOVER, DEL., AND SUE HOECHSTETTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FARMWORKER ORGANIZATIONS

Ms. CANNING. Thank you, Senator. My name is Sue Canning, and I am the executive director of the Del-Mar-Va Rural Ministries, a farmworker governed service organization serving Delaware, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and the Eastern Shore of Virginia. We operate a tristate migrant health program funded by DHEW which services approximately 8,000 migrants. We are considered an upstream migrant program.

We have been working with farmworkers and their needs on the east coast for approximately 7 years. With me today is Sue Hoechstetter, food and nutrition director of the National Association of Farmworker Organizations, NAFO, of which Del-Mar-Va is a board member.

We thank you for inviting NAFO to testify before the Senate Agriculture Committee today. NAFO is an association of approximately 70 farmworker governed organizations throughout the United States who represent the rights of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and also provides services to them.

NAFO discussed the health plight of farmworkers and the general exploitation to which they have been subjected in testimony before the subcommittee hunger hearings in May 1979. We have referred you to the rather lengthy discussion and a good description of the nature of farmworker life. The subcommittee is probably aware of the hunger and malnutrition problems faced by the country's migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

They include the list in the January 1980 report of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Advisory Council on Infant and Fetal Nutrition by its migrant representative, Sam Byrd. They include infant mortality among migrant farmworkers, which is 24 percent higher than the national average, incidence of infectious disease, evidenced at 20 percent higher among migrants than other groups in society, migrant births outside hospitals which occur at a rate nine times higher than the national average, incidence of malnutrition, prenatal, postnatal, child anemia which are higher among migrants than other subpopulations in the country.

---

[1] See p. 101 for the prepared statement of Ms. Canning.

In addition, the tools available to most populations to fight hunger problems, the Federal programs, are not easily accessible to migrant farmworker populations.

The Field Association reported to the subcommittee last spring that migrants and their children receive the lowest level of participation in all Federal food programs.

The WIC program, with its focus on health and nutrition, can be important in changing this dire situation. In 1978, Congress passed the child nutrition amendments which reauthorized and expanded WIC and increased funding to migrant farmworkers. USDA has taken some actions in the interest of implementing 1978 WIC legislation to meet the needs of farmworkers. However, the action has been designed to assist a stable population and has, therefore, been much less effective than they could have been for migrant farmworkers.

When workers come into the new WIC project, they are often met by a series of delays preventing them from receiving the benefits which they need promptly before moving on again. Reasons for the delays include lack of program uniformity—information and verification of certification, the VOC card, that migrants receive from the WIC program in their last State or project area visited is often not the same information required in the new State's VOC card. Because each State may draw up a VOC card of its own, lack of proper information may cause delays and sometimes nondelivery of WIC benefits to farmworkers that are on the move.

Often, the information on the VOC card may match the information required in the new area, but the requirements for determining who is at nutritional risk may be different.

Barriers are often then again raised to farmworkers receiving continuous WIC benefits according to the Texas rural legal assistance program. TRLA found last year that many migrants who were in the WIC program last year and traveled in the Mideastern stream were not allowed to continue the program in Michigan or experience recertification delays because their hematocrit levels did not meet Michigan standards which were different from that of Texas. Lack of standard definition among different States of who is a migrant worker also creates difficulties for providing continuous services. USDA targeted migrants in some ways in 1979 in an effort to make the program more accessible to them.

Some farmworkers who traveled in the stream were able to get WIC certification while they were working in the fields up North under their migrant status, but were not classified as migrants when they returned to their home-base States, Florida, Texas, and California, for the winter months. They were thus on waiting lists in parts of these States where funds were available for migrants, and then stopped receiving benefits when they returned home.

Migrants face WIC funding problems, as do all of the other populations, only more often. They may not be in the area long enough to receive funds if they are on a waiting list. Once receiving WIC benefits, the migrant may move on to another area where he will be put on a waiting list again.

As described in Sam Byrd's report to the National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant and Fetal Nutrition, use of current

WIC funding methods restrict migrant farmworkers because they are not included in the general State funding formula. They, therefore, should receive a special funding. Twice in 1979 and once in 1980 the department made special allocations available to States serving migrants—special funds. States were not given much leadtime to apply for these funds.

In 1979, a total of 25 States applied for special migrant funds and did not include some of the States with high migrant impact areas. In my particular area, this included the State of Maryland, which sees about 3,000 migrants during the harvest season, and also included the State of Florida, which is a major high impact area.

USDA made a positive step in providing special funds for migrants, but they did so with no assurance that the State who received the special allocation would receive adequate funds to serve migrants for the next year.

Some States who receive special allocations also complain that the funds came after the migrants left the State, and it is questionable as to what degree the States who did not request funds served farmworkers. Of course, WIC programs could not be expected to improve the services to migrants without doing some outreach. There was no outreach money tied to these allocations. That is called an administrative cost.

Another reason that the special migrant allocation did not work very well was that money could not be shifted from State to State as needed due to the unexpected changes in the migrant stream.

In our area right now, we are about 3 weeks behind our harvest season because of the rain. Asparagus usually starts right about now, but we expect that the season will be delayed about 3 or 4 weeks.

So that this type of flexibility is really important in operating a migrant program. Migrant farmworkers often live in rural areas that are difficult to reach. They work long hours, and work is not restricted to one family member. Therefore, it is difficult to take time from work to get to the WIC clinic which is often quite far away, if it is in the area at all.

Senator McGOVERN. Ms. Canning, because of the time constraints, I wonder if you could take a few moments to summarize the balance of your statement, or if there is any one or two points that you wanted to just highlight—and, of course, we will make the entire statement part of the record, as though read. But I do want to take a few minutes for questions of the panel here. And I would appreciate it, if there is any one or two points that you want to just kind of highlight, if you could do that.

Ms. CANNING. Well, I think the major point, then, I am concerned about as—you know, I am at the grassroots level in delivering services—is the flexibility.

We are talking about in our Del-Mar-Va area only 600 children that are available for WIC services. But it is a very important client. That is over a three-State area.

Senator McGOVERN. 600 children?

Ms. CANNING. 600 kids, and pregnant women, only. But it is three States, and that necessitates me, if I would like to be a subcontractor, negotiating with five separate administrations. And that is a tremendously time-consuming portion in terms of administration. But it also requires five separate reporting requirements for about approximately less than $10,000.

I would like Sue Hoechstetter from NAFO to give you, in summary, our suggestions for improvements of this program.

Senator McGovern. OK.

Ms. Hoechstetter. We see a need for the WIC program to move toward federalization, to move toward more authority for the Secretary in serving farmworkers because of the lack of uniformity among the State programs. Farmworkers, in order to stay on the program once they get on, need uniform standards.

There are delays when migrants reach new WIC project areas because the information needed from one State to another is different, the availability of slots is different from one State to another, and there are waiting lists. In order to obtain continuous WIC services for farmworkers and to reach the farmworkers who are not on the program, there must be a national focus.

In 1974, the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs reported to you, that "the first recommendation, therefore, calls for the complete federalization of Federal food programs as they apply to Indians and migrants". Indians have gotten there, migrants have not.

Senator McGovern. Do you think that is the most important thing that Congress could mandate in order to improve migrant farmworker access to the WIC program?

Ms. Canning. I have just returned from the National Advisory Council on Migrant Health. I have an appointment there by former Secretary Califano. And the Undersecretary of HEW reported that the cooperation between the two offices, Migrant Health and the Department of Agriculture's WIC program, is outstanding.

But what we are getting bogged down with is negotiating with each State to have the flexibility to deal with the farmworker issue. And I feel very strongly that if we were to nationalize this program, make farmworkers a special population along with Indians, that we could get the services out there, and probably more cost effectively, with groups like migrant health or farmworker organizations that are already delivering nutrition services.

Senator McGovern. I think that has always been the problem with farmworkers, that the jurisdictional responsibilities always cloud the issue—whether it is a county or municipal or State or Federal. I remember the Governor of one State telling me at a congressional hearing 10 years ago, he said, "These people are Federal people. We have nothing to do with them."

And the Federal Government, of course, usually counters that they are—if they are in an area over a given period of time, then the county has some responsibility.

If there are migrant farmer organizations that are in close touch with the migrant workers, and there are, why do you think there has not been better coordination between WIC and these organizations that are already in being that are in touch with the farmworkers?

Ms. Canning. I am not sure why it does not happen, but I did sit down, for instance, in Delaware last week, to try and negotiate a no money contract for assigning a WIC certifier to our office. It is going to take 3½ months to do that, to get just that contract approved up to the Secretary of the health and social services level. And that is no cash. It has to be signed by 10 people just to have a WIC certified assigned to our plan. And that is not soon enough because the farmworkers are going to be here 3 weeks.

Senator McGOVERN. Any other points?

Ms. HOECHSTETTER. The migrant health clinics and farmworker organizations, seem to sometimes be outside of the informal, or the formal structures set up at the State level to provide WIC services. USDA has given the lowest priority to farmworker organizations to provide farmworkers with WIC services.

We think that, nationalizing the program for migrants could help see that the coordination between Farmworker Organizations and State WIC programs takes place.

Senator McGOVERN. Ms. Reed, you made an impassioned plea not to go along with the Senate Budget Committee cut. Just in a nutshell, what would be the impact of the cuts recommended by the Budget Committee, as you see it? How does that translate into human terms?

Ms. REED. Again, I think, perhaps, I can speak best for my own region. It would mean that, essentially, we would have no WIC expansion at all. We are limited——

Senator McGOVERN. It freezes the program?

Ms. REED. Right. Most of the States in the Southeast are in what they call the hold harmless State category. The need for WIC in the South is substantial, and when WIC was funded under the title I formula, a good bit of money was put into WIC programs in the region.

But there is no State in the South that it currently, serving more than about 35 percent of those in need. In Florida, WIC is meeting only 18 percent of the need.

If my calculations are correct, final adoption of the Senate Budget Committee recommendation would mean that all Southern States would have massive waiting lists for WIC, 190,000 people in Georgia would continue to be unserved.

Senator McGOVERN. The administration proposed to prohibit any new WIC commodity or voucher program from opening where there is any other type of WIC program operating. What impact do you see of that guideline, or have you thought that through?

Ms. REED. Again, as I mentioned, the foundation is opposed to this particular provision. We think that the two programs, the commodity program and the WIC program, are, distinct programs. In some communities, one program is better able to meet the needs of pregnant women and children than the other.

The people who have contacted me in Miami, the large Haitian community—and although there has been some special WIC money put into Miami to serve the Haitian community, housing conditions in that area are rather unbelievable. Refrigeration, in many instances, is not available. To take away the possible alternative of initiating a commodity program because there is a WIC program in the Miami area might be detrimental to that particular community.

Senator McGOVERN. Yes. You need a little more flexibility.

Ms. REED. Right.

Senator McGOVERN. Ms. Melton and Dr. Gebhardt, both in your different ways, I think you have dramatized the value of this program. And we do appreciate your personal testimony about the effectiveness; you as a doctor, in participating and talking with the women and the children who are involved, and you, Ms. Melton, as an actual participant. We do want to thank you for your appearance before the committee.

Ms. MELTON. Thank you.

Senator McGOVERN. All right. Thank you very much for your contributions; I appreciate them. Good luck.

Our final witness is Ms. Susan Fridy of the National Milk Producers Federation. Ms. Fridy is here, and we will hear from her at this time.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN FRIDY, DIRECTOR, CONSUMER AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS, MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Ms. FRIDY. Thank you very much for the opportunity to come here this morning. I represent the National Milk Producers Federation, and you are very aware of the organization, and I would like to just save some time and skip through some of our most important points and then present my written statement for the record.[1]

We are very alarmed at the proposed budget cuts which would be working against the concept of full funding for the child nutrition programs, and I know this is an area with which you share great concern.

There are few programs which we feel are just critical and few of the cuts that we feel merit special attention. One is the nickel cut and the reduced eligibility guidelines for the school lunch programs.

We just feel that if these cuts go through, it is going to undermine the nutritional excellence of these programs, and we feel the 4-percent estimated reduction in participation is much too modest an estimation.

I, of course, could not come before you without mentioning the special milk program and that we are concerned with the proposed 55.7 million cut. It is a program that the Senate listened to thoroughly last year in full debate, and the program is recognized for its important contribution to the nutritional well-being of the American schoolchild.

There are few regulatory matters which we are concerned about with the child nutrition programs and which affect diary. One is the status of whole milk in the child nutrition programs. In the past when milk was offered, it was always whole milk. In the past few years in response to a different view of dietary guidelines, low fat milks and skim milk have been offered in the programs.

We have had no objection to the concept of choice to the child. We find now in the latest regulations that have been published by USDA that whole milk is discriminated against in the programs. We would like this to be considered by the committee as well as the fact that up to 50 percent of cheeses that are used in the programs can be imitation cheeses, and we feel this creates the beginning of a nutritional risk to children.

---

[1] See p. 104 for the prepared statement of Ms. Fridy.

We would like you to consider these two measures as you write your bill. Again, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify. I hope the committee will have time to look more thoroughly at the statement because we do go into a number of other issues in greater detail.

Senator **McGovern**. I guess the best thing that can be said about the cut in the special milk program is that it is less than the cut proposed last year.

Ms. **Fridy**. Well, I must say that this cut, as you know, cuts have been proposed repeatedly over the years. This cut is the most tolerable in that it retains the program in its full ability. No child is discriminated against in being thrown out of a program.

Senator **McGovern**. It is really the subsidy that is cut rather than the entitlement under the program.

Ms. **Fridy**. That is right. The program remains intact, and if we get ourselves in the country in a better budgetary position, then we can continue to expand the half pint subsidy.

Senator **McGovern**. On a level of intensity, I assume you feel somewhat less strongly about serving low fat milk as over against the possibility of reducing funding for the program as a whole.

Ms. **Fridy**. Well, we recognize, as you do, that these child nutrition programs are a living model of good nutrition.

Senator **McGovern**. Yes.

Ms. **Fridy**. And we feel that when the designers of the dietary goals put the report together that I do not think the intention was to target the dairy industry when so many other high fat foods are served in the school lunch program.

What we found is, you know, it is to the benefit of a school's budget to offer skim milk because children generally do not like it, and therefore, many children do not choose to drink milk, and we feel whole milk should be available to them.

Senator **McGovern**. My impression is that the witnesses that helped us put together the dietary guidelines were not strongly recommending low fat milk for children, that that would be better maybe for people my age, but that a growing child probably needs whole milk.

Ms. **Fridy**. Well, the Department of Agriculture has found that one of the problems with the children's diet is a lack of calories, and certainly serving skim milk does not serve to help that problem, and a lack of calories, we feel, pushes the child into choosing some very low nutrient dense foods to make up for their energy needs.

Senator **McGovern**. Well, thank you, Ms. Fridy. I know the federation's great support over the years for all of these nutritional programs. We have always had the support of the federation. We appreciate that.

And these points that you made, I think, are legitimate areas of concern and ones that we will be very much aware of. Thank you for being here today.

Ms. **Fridy**. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator **McGovern**. That completes our testimony for today.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., April 17, 1980, in room 324, Russell Senate Office Building.]

REVIEW OF CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1980

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NUTRITION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:40 a.m., in room 324, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. George McGovern (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators McGovern, Dole, and Hayakawa.

Senator McGOVERN. The committee will come to order.

Mrs. Jane Wynn, legislative chairperson, American School Food Service Association of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Welcome to the committee. Good to see you again.

Mrs. WYNN. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JANE WYNN, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRPERSON, AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION, FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

Mrs. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I am Jane Wynn, legislative chairperson for the American School Food Service Association, and food service program analyst for the School Board of Broward County, Fla. I am accompanied today by Marion Harrison, of the firm of Barnett, Alagia & Carey.

We meet here today during very trying economic times. Calls for a balanced budget can be heard from every quarter. Just 8 weeks after sending his 1980 budget to the Congress, President Carter has resubmitted a second budget that is in balance. The House Budget Committee has called for a balanced budget, as has the Budget Committee of the U.S. Senate. Indeed, earlier this session the Senate Agriculture Committee indicated its desire to trim Government spending.

The American School Food Service Association is composed of conservative people who want to do their part.

We find the current situation, however, both confusing and difficult. The national school lunch program—a program near and dear to our hearts—is a program that works and works well. Recently the Washington Post spoke of the WIC program as a program worthy of expansion even during these times. We would expand that editorialization to the entire array of child nutrition programs. If there is any Federal effort designed to help people that should be a pride to this country, it is our child nutrition programs.

The report of the Field Foundation, which was presented to this committee last year, makes it overwhelmingly clear that our nutrition programs are a major exception to the belief that the Federal

Government cannot do anything correctly. Summarizing their findings, the Field Foundation medical team, after extensive field investigations, told this committee: "Our first and overwhelming impression is that there are far fewer grossly malnourished people in this country today than there were 10 years ago." The doctors went on to attribute this success to the expansion of the Federal feeding effort in the United States.

Notwithstanding these findings, we are being asked today to accept approximately one-half billion dollars in cuts in the child nutrition budget. We are being asked to help balance the budget, not to reduce the inflation rate, but to provide a psychogical or symbolic victory. We are being asked to update the benefits provided under the school lunch program on an annual basis, rather than twice a year, and to cut benefits that have a positive medical impact on the health of our children. And, now we learn that the administration has underestimated Federal adjustment assistance payments to workers laid off in U.S. plants by approximately $1.1 billion.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we are not quite sure how to respond to the proposed child nutrition reductions given the current context.

We certainly do not wish to place our close friends and allies on this committee, who have been dedicated supporters of child nutrition over the years, in the politically impossible situation of going to the floor of the Senate seeking to add a half billion dollars to the President's budget in the area of child nutrition during an election year. Yet, we cannot in good conscience endorse these cuts.

The administration's proposed cuts on child nutrition implies a fundamental misunderstanding of how the school lunch program operates. A local school food service authority is basically a business and, as such, must remain economically viable. The local lunch program receives money from the Federal Government through sections 4 and 11, from State governments in varying amounts, from county governments occasionally, and, of course, from the students themselves. Money from all these sources goes into one kitty. There is not one account for poor children and a different account for nonpoor children. ASFSA, therefore, opposes reductions in any and all reimbursement rates.

Proposition 13 has had an impact all over the country, not just in California. The Congress this year seems intent on eliminating the States' share of revenue sharing. These actions strain local school food budgets. If Federal reimbursement rates are reduced, we fear that many local communities will no longer be able to continue a lunch program.

When the administration originally presented its proposal to this committee last year, it testified that its goal was to target benefits more accurately on those students most in need. Such a statement makes sense in the area of food stamps or social security or other programs that provide direct money assistance to a recipient. However, it is not appropriate in the school lunch program.

If the program does not remain economically viable and no longer can afford to operate, no one in the community is served. While sections 4 and 11 subsidies to the school lunch program are based on the income of the students participating in the program, the subsidy goes to the program. It does not result in a direct payment to the student. This may seem like a subtle distinction at first, but it is fundamental and goes to the heart of the debate with regard to school lunch. An examination of this distinction is essential to a full and fair airing of this issue.

The administration has said repeatedly that in tight budgetary times we should cut section 4 because it is less important to protect middle-class children than poor children. They are correct that it is more important to protect those at the bottom end of the economic ladder than it is those at the top. There are, however, areas of the country where school food authorities that contain an extremely high percentage of free and reduced price lunch recipients are, in fact, in better financial shape than schools that contain mostly paying students. The financial health of a local school lunch program has more to do with local labor costs and local indirect expenses than with the family income of the students.

As this committee realized when it passed Senate Resolution 90 last year, the Department of Agriculture has virtually no data on the economic situation of individual school food service authorities. The idea of taking direct Federal subsidies from nonpoor people before taking from poor people cannot possibly be challenged. But it does not follow that because the section 4 and section 11 subsidies to the schools are based on the income of the student's family that you accomplish the goal of reducing support to less poor children as opposed to poor children by cutting section 4 before cutting section 11. In fact, we suspect the opposite may be true, that is, by attempting to reduce support to the middle-class children, the entire feeding program may be jeopardized.

We oppose reductions in section 4, as well as all other reimbursement rates, because it is part of the economic backbone of the program, not because ASFSA has middle-class members and wishes to protect middle-class children. We want to protect all children, but cannot do so with a 30-percent cut in the section 4 subsidy to the nonpoor.

The American School Food Service Association believes that if cuts must be made in the area of child nutrition—cuts which we still oppose—the least destructive are the administration's proposals with regard to the summer feeding programs, the special milk program, and the updating of benefits annually as opposed to twice a year. These three proposals would result in a savings of $170 million. Other cuts that would not affect the basic structure of the school lunch or breakfast programs include:

Reducing equipment assistance by $5 million, coupled with elimination of the reserve clause;

Reducing nutrition education and training assistance by $5 million for fiscal year 1981, coupled with a provision that guarantees $0.50 per student per year in future years.

In addition to the special milk cut offered by the administration, ASFSA feels that the free milk program should be limited to one nonmeal free milk per student per day.

The committee might also want to consider increasing slightly the charge for a reduced price lunch and requiring the States to match, to some small extent, section 11 support. Currently only section 4 has a matching requirement.

May we also suggest that this committee augment its Senate Resolution 90 study by retaining a consultant to make an independent cost accounting analysis, from a business standpoint, of local school food service authorities around the country. We are never going to be able to analyze objectively the economic impact of any proposed changes in the school lunch program if any change in section 11 is perceived of as affecting only poor people and if changes in section 4 are perceived as affecting only nonpoor students.

ASFSA would like to comment briefly on the proposal which the committee considered, and rejected, to deduct school lunch benefits from food stamps. We believe your judgment was correct.

School meals are needed to supplement the diet of growing bodies and minds. The average food stamp benefit of 35 cents per person, per meal, does not provide a nutritionally adequate diet, as USDA's own studies indicate. Individuals with above average nutritional needs, like growing children, must have their diets supplemented beyond food stamps.

In addition, such a proposal would forever link school lunch with the array of welfare-type programs. Students would, in effect, be asked to buy their school meals with food stamps. This would run directly counter to the long-held goal of this committee of trying to minimize identification of students in the lunch room by income category.

Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to respond to any questions you may have at this time, and I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you, Mrs. Wynn.

I take note of the alternative recommended reduction you have made, that you propose, but what if we had to go as high as the $500 million recommended by the Senate Budget Committee? I hope that won't be necessary. Senator Cranston and others in the Senate have offered an alternative budget to the Budget Committee's resolution. His still comes out with a balanced budget, but this resolution that came out of the Budget Committee is based on the assumption, I think, that the best way to make this country strong is to turn over the U.S. Treasury to the Defense Department.

What Senator Cranston is attempting to do is strike a balance, a little better balance between strengthening the domestic resources of this country as against spending so much getting ready for war. I just wondered if we had to go, though, to a $500-million cut in the nutritional programs, do you see any additional areas beyond those you have mentioned that we could cut? I think the ones you have mentioned here probably come to a couple hundred million. But do you see any others that we could cut?

Mrs. WYNN. We have been contacting quite a bit of the association membership throughout the country, and one thing that was mentioned is the changing of the guidelines at the top of the ladder—in other words, raising the guidelines for reduced price meals. Of course, I will have to say that at the same time when I say that about changing the guidelines, I feel that some of our memberships indicate that a proposal such as that and a proposal such as is in the administration bill of conducting a pilot project on verifying incomes and asking for social security numbers—that the need for those would not be nearly as great and there could be a savings involved. If, and I realize that there are people in this room that don't agree with me, but if the scale was not on the application, I don't think we would be hurting those people who are eligible and need the program, but we in the local school districts, when we are checking applications, as we do quite often now, we see situations where we feel that perhaps there are people who are not really eligible for the program. That is what we get from our membership.

Now, we wouldn't have to change the guidelines if we could do something like that.

The other thing I would like to comment on is we take great exception, if there must be exception for a cut, which we wholeheartedly oppose—I think my statement shows the priority we put on that—we take great exception to the administration targeting all reductions in section 4 to the paying students. The paying students are already taking the brunt of the inflation. There are already sale price increases in school lunch now. To take the whole amount of money and say it comes out of the paying student we feel is discriminatory. We feel that section 4 is the basic subsidy for the lunch. If there is going to have to be a reduction in section 4, we believe it should be across the board—not that we want to see that happen.

Senator McGOVERN. What about the argument that is made that that then places a heavy burden on the poor and the low-income students? As I understand the rationale for the 5-cent cut, it falls most heavily on the middle and higher income students.

Mrs. WYNN. Well, it does. I don't understand the argument that that would hurt the economically needy. By and large, those students are going to be served. The paying child is the one that you see dropping out of the program. We do have, as I mentioned in my statement, districts in this country where if you have 55–60 percent economically needy, you have not a very solvent program, but you can make ends meet. When you drop down to 25 percent, 20–25, 30 percent, you are going to run in the red, and you have to keep those paying children in the program.

Like any food service industry, volume is the key to our efficiency, and when the paying children drop out, our unit cost goes up and then we lose the whole program.

Senator McGOVERN. I think that is an argument that is not sometimes understood, that if you lose the paying students to the point where the school district decides to close down the program, then everybody gets hit.

The National Anti-Hunger Coalition is supporting a breakfast option. As I understand that formula, if schools have 25 percent or more of their students enrolled in the free- or reduced-price program, a referendum would be required among the parents in that school as to whether or not they wanted a breakfast program, and if voted in the affirmative, it would become compulsory for the school district to set it up. What is the position of your association on that?

Mrs. WYNN. Our association has and continues to strongly support the expansion of the breakfast program. We are not certain

50

that a referendum at the local level will do that. We did have the opportunity to meet with the sponsors of that bill and express some of those concerns, and I must say that some of those concerns come from my own State of Florida, where we have had that same type of local referendum, without the final teeth to back it, to make it mandatory with the parents.

I think some of us in Florida feel that a school administrator can, if they are opposed philosophically to that, can influence the referendum, but we would not oppose any effort to expand the breakfast program. Of course many of our members of our association also work for the chief State school officers and I am not at all certain of their position on this issue.

Senator McGOVERN. Which do you think would be better for the poor children, changing the eligibility requirement for free- and reduced-price lunches or cutting section 11 reimbursement by an equal amount?

Mrs. WYNN. Well, originally, when we were trying to come up with our options, we had proposed, because we don't want to harm the basic structure of the program—we wanted to be able to come back with the least amount of trouble—we had proposed a more or less across-the-board percentage decrease for all, the reimbursement for all of the programs. We have found that there is a segment of our membership, primarily large major cities—I would use New York City and Los Angeles as two examples—where even though they don't represent most of the school districts in the country, they do represent a large number of meals served, and they were concerned about that. I don't understand it, and I would like sometime to really sit down and discuss it with them, but their concern was legitimate. They don't want their section 11 money touched. They don't feel that they can meet their—I believe it is meet their district's indirect costs if they have any reduction in section 11. That is why we feel that if there is any reduction in section 4, though that is the basic subsidy for the luncheon, it should be across the board.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Wynn.

We will continue with the witnesses, unless there is some other point you want to make.

Mrs. WYNN. No, sir, just that we thank you very much for all of your efforts.

Senator McGOVERN. Our next panel is Dr. Joseph Scherer, director of Government Relations of the National PTA, and Barbara Bode, president of the Children's Foundation.

Welcome to the committee.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOSEPH SCHERER, DIRECTOR OF GOVERMENT RELATIONS, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

Dr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I am Joseph Scherer, director of Governmental Relations with the National PTA.

I would like to take just a moment to briefly touch on three concerns that the National PTA has regarding the proposed cuts.

First, the nickel cut. This proposal's impact is probably the most damaging and the least understood. A 5-cent reduction actually cuts out funding for 10 percent of the school lunch program. The nickel cut represents one-third of the current cash reimbursement to paying students. The 5-cent reduction in Federal reimbursement will have an impact on the States since section 4 is the basis for State matching money. For example, California will lose $37 million, $14 million of which can be attributed to the 5-cent cut. The loss of revenue will sharply increase the price of school lunches. Again, for example, the States of California and Washington both project the average price for a school lunch to exceed $1. A substantial portion of this increase can be attributed to the reduction in Federal reimbursement, and with the cost of preparing a bag lunch at 90 cents or 95 cents, it may be more cost efficient for a parent to send their child to school with a cold lunch that may be less nutritious. Also, the parents have less control, with a bag lunch, over whether or not the child actually eats lunch.

Middle-income parents will be expected to pick up the extra costs resulting from the 5-cent reduction in reimbursement to paying students. The families who are hit the hardest are those with incomes that barely exceed what is estimated to purchase necessities. The children from these families cannot qualify for reduced price meals, and with prices increasing faster than earning power, these families face the real possibility of having to trade off one essential against another. There is no margin in their budgets, and, therefore, every nickel counts.

The Shawnee Mission, Kans., school district represents a good illustration of how the 5-cent cut impacts a local community. Currently, 93 percent of the 20,000 students pay for their lunch. The 5-cent reduction will result in a loss of $150,000, and the school district indicates the parents will be responsible for providing the funds to offset this loss in revenue. Many of the families in the district are single parent families and the district does not feel that these families are able to offset the loss of income from reduced Federal reimbursement. As a matter of fact, the district expects the participation to decrease significantly.

Second, the revised eligibility guidelines: The proposed changes in eligibility guidelines affect those families that can least afford to pay. The USDA estimates that if the eligibility for a free lunch is increased from 100 percent to 125 percent of the poverty level, there will be a 25-percent drop in participation. Further, if the eligibility for a reduced price meal is increased from 175 percent to 195 percent of the poverty level, the USDA projects a 50-percent drop in participation.

The estimates of the USDA are simply that—estimates, and there seems to be evidence, at least from our point of view, to suggest that these estimates might be on the conservative side. For example, a study conducted by the California Office of Child Nutrition Services indicates that students receiving reduced price meals pay $18 a year, but if they were no longer eligible they would have to pay $90 a year. This represents a 500-percent increase. In Shawnee Mission, Kans., students in the reduced price category currently pay 20 cents. If they move to a paying status, they will be paying 75 cents for an elementary school lunch, or 85 cents for a high school lunch, which represents respective increases of 375 percent and 425 percent.

And, finally, the inflation factor: With the State and Federal Government paying less of the cost of the school lunch program, where will the money come from? Increasingly school districts are faced with tax and spending limitations that threaten the continuation of programs. Sharply rising costs in energy, wages, et cetera are causing the costs of school lunches to increase. Last year, for example, and again in Shawnee Mission, Kans., the cost of a school lunch increased 10 cents due to inflation, and participation dropped 9 percent. Next year the school district will have to increase the lunches another 10 cents.

A majority of the students in the State of Kansas are in the paying category, and prices went up due to inflation on the average of 5 to 15 cents statewide last year. The State estimates that prices will have to be raised an additional 15 cents next year to keep up with inflation. In some cities, the wage scale may be high enough so parents can pick up the additional costs, but in Topeka, for example, Goodyear is in the process of laying off approximately 1,000 workers and with school lunches rising on an average of 80 cents in 2 years, it appears that participation will drop markedly.

In summary, two points seem critical:

One, it is the compounding of variables that creates a snowball effect. It is the 5-cent cut, the change in eligibility guidelines and inflation taken together that are causing tremendous increases in both the cost and price of school lunches. The variables are interrelated and thus difficult to separate out.

Two, it is premature to alter the school lunch program when data has not yet been received on the study the Senate commissioned to investigate the effectiveness of the School Lunch Act.

Parents feel that what is at stake here is not just a nickel; it is the entire school lunch program. The proposed reduction represents more than an effort to balance the Federal budget; it is a fundamental shift in the Federal Government's commitment to the nonpoor. A change in this commitment jeopardizes the entire program and with the entire program goes the services to those with the greatest need.

Senator McGovern. Thank you, Dr. Scherer, for your testimony. We will move on to hear from Ms. Bode, and then I will have a couple questions.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA BODE, PRESIDENT, THE CHILDREN'S FOUNDATION

Miss Bode. I am Barbara Bode, president of the Children's Foundation.

Some 34 years ago, following World War II, the national school lunch program was authorized, in the interest of national security, as Congress then stated, to safeguard the health of the Nation's children and to support agricultural production. One major impetus for the program's authorization was the Surgeon General's statement in 1946 that 70 percent of the boys who 10 to 12 years earlier were poorly nourished were rejected by the Selective Service System. Now we are at peace abroad, in a relative sense, but our war on hunger here at home must continue if the security of our country is to be maintained.

Many Members of Congress and the public are currently urging increases in the military budget for the sake of national defense. We would submit, as did the Surgeon General in 1946, that a properly nourished, adequately fed populace is critical to the strength of the Nation. Therefore, if for no other reason, any attempts to undercut Federal food assistant programs must be rejected.

Unhappily, the administration and some of our elected and appointed officials, in their haste to balance the budget, have forgotten the post-war wisdom of the Congress in 1946 and are recommending cuts in both the food stamp and child nutrition programs. Perhaps they have been lulled into forgetfulness by the successes of the past decade in diminishing severe hunger among our poorest citizens and in improving the diets of all through supportive programs ranging from school lunch to the child care food program.

In this regard, we want to commend your committee for voting against the proposal to reduce food stamp benefits for families with children in schools that offer the lunch program. This proposal is particularly alarming not only because the thrifty food plan in no way provides for an adequate diet, but also because it would seriously undercut the national school lunch program and, by implication, threaten the other child nutrition programs as well. We urge you to work to defeat any efforts to pass this proposal on the floor as part of the budget resolution.

The specific issue I would like to address today is the proposed cuts in the child nutrition programs. The attachment to my testimony details these cuts and some of our reasons for concern. With your permission, I would like to submit these comments for the record.[1]

Senator McGOVERN. Without objection, that will be done.

Miss BODE. Basically we oppose any reductions in eligibility or subsidies for the programs. At a time when food and production costs are rising rapidly and family buying power is shrinking, it is counterproductive—if not foolhardy—to further squeeze the family food budget by limiting participation in child nutrition programs by law or economics, or both.

Let's consider, for example, the proposed 5-cent cut in subsidies for lunch for schoolchildren not eligible for free or reduced price meals. Because such a measure would decrease the State's matching share, in addition to Federal support for the program, it would raise prices to a point at which many families could no longer afford to pay for school lunches. The resultant drop in participation would also cause the firing of cafeteria workers. No one can judge the cost or nutritional quality of bag lunches brought from home. I would bet, however, that only the vending machines would benefit from the cut in the long run.

If, as we all have heard, there is a concern that the children of the Members and staff of the Congress and children of political appointees and the children of those earning well above the average are being supported by the tax dollars of the lesser paid, we agree. We would suggest that a cut-off of subsidies be set for their children and for children of parents earning more than $30,000 annually. We must not be trapped, however, into thinking that because you and I may have only earned $2,000 a year at our first job that $15,000 is now adequate to support a family of four in today's economy.

---

[1] See p. 106.

Moreover, in light of this recognition and our intensifying inflation, to reduce a child's eligibility for free- or reduced-price meals we believe is a grave mistake. I am tempted to recall for you Senator Aiken's strong statement in support of the bill that resulted in the National School Lunch Act and the comments of Senator Clark and Senator Kennedy following their investigation of hunger in our country. After their hard work and yours, and yours, in particular, to bring an end to this tragedy, I can't believe that the Congress is ready to nickel and dime children back into hunger and malnutrition.

The current proposals to cut child nutrition funds have already had a negative impact on expansion of the school breakfast program by exacerbating the fears of school administrators that Congress does not have a firm commitment to funding the program. We ask that you reaffirm your commitment by restoring commodities to the program through changing the authorization so that commodities must be provided for it.

We also ask that you reaffirm your commitment to school breakfast expansion by providing "severe need" reimbursement rates to all schools with costs greater than the regular reimbursement rate and by providing parents with access to reliable information about the school breakfast program. A particular provision we would like the committee to consider for inclusion in its bill for reauthorization of child nutrition programs this year would require school boards to request a feasibility study from the State and an agreement to hold a public hearing on school breakfast if 50 parents request implementation of the program. This would require no new paperwork, and would not take the final decision away from the school board, but it would guarantee that more information makes its way into the school district and that the school breakfast program would get a fair hearing.

Our key recommendation regarding the summer program is the schools be required to decide whether or not they wish to sponsor the program by February 1 each year. This measure would insure that private sponsors would know early enough in the year to plan and to apply for sponsorship of summer food for those areas that will be unserved by the schools.

Overall, again in the interest of national security, and as a measure of commonsense, I again urge you to reject the attempts to chip away at the budget for child nutrition and other Federal food assistance programs.

Thank you.

Senator McGovern. Thank you very much, Ms. Bode.

How would you respond to Ms. Wynn's comment that cutting section 4 before section 11 may actually reduce support to poor children more than support to nonpoor?

Miss Bode. If there were to be any cut at all in section 4, we would suggest a lower cut. We would suggest a 3-cent cut. I cannot respond specifically to Miss Wynn's estimates, but we feel rather than any cut in section 11, which we think is terribly dangerous, we, with great reluctance, would say that a reduction in eligibility for reduced price meals from 195 percent to 175 percent of poverty would be more acceptable and less harmful.

Senator McGOVERN. If you had to choose?

Miss BODE. If we had to choose, yes.

Senator McGOVERN. Maybe I could ask you, Dr. Scherer, and Ms. Bode, to respond to the same question I put to Ms. Wynn. If we get stuck with the Budget Committee recommendation for a half million dollar cut in the child nutrition programs, which is a very substantial slash, and you had to carve that out, where would you apply it? Maybe each one of you could comment on that.

I am hoping it won't be necessary, that we can make some cuts elsewhere in the Federal budget, rather than at the expense of the nutrition programs. But if we had to cut, where would you apply it?

Miss BODE. That is what makes it so difficult. Again, as Miss Wynn said in her testimony, as Mr. McIntyre said, as the White House said, and you and other Members said, none of this is really going to help inflation, none of this is going to help families pay for food for their children any better, none of the cuts in the child nutrition programs or food stamp programs or, indeed, any of the other domestic programs will help inflation, so it makes it very difficult for us to say we support anything. We would find some cuts less objectionable than others, and special milk seems to be high on everybody's list as it is ours. Special milk is one of the cuts we find less objectionable. Another is not the 5-cent, but the 3-cent, or even possibly 4-cent cut in section 4.

Equipment assistance can certainly be cut to a certain extent. Again I mentioned the reduction in the reduced-price eligibility with some trepidation. We have to be careful about this. The administration's suggestion that eligibility for free meals for children be reduced from 125 percent to 100 percent of poverty, we feel is just totally unacceptable, particularly because the kids from families that are above 100 percent and around 125 percent of poverty are unlikely to be eligible for any of the other benefits, from any of the other programs.

And, finally, while annual indexing is again not something we would welcome at all, and, in fact, we object to it strongly, it is clearly better than reducing eligibility for free meals.

Senator McGOVERN. Even with all of those cuts, that didn't come to a half million dollars, or even close to it, but I know the problem.

Dr. Scherer.

Dr. SCHERER. We would agree with Miss Bode, with one addition: Our membership is very split on the breakfast program, and that is not the highest priority now of the National PTA, so we would be willing to be more flexible regarding cuts in this area.

Also, with regard to the eligibility guidelines, we would reluctantly go with a change in the eligibility guidelines for reduced-price meal; it would be more acceptable than changes in guidelines for free meals. And equipment assistance cuts, again, would also be an area which we would find at least somewhat acceptable.

I think the key things for our organization are we would like to stand as firmly as possible on the nickel cut in Federal reimbursement to paying students, and remain firm on the eligibility guidelines.

Senator McGovern. Thank you very much for your testimony, folks. We appreciate it.

The next panel is Project Smile, School Meals Industry for Learning and Education, with Louis Sabatasso, president of Sabatasso's Pizza, Santa Ana, Calif., and Chip Goodman, vice president, Larry's Food Products, Gardena, Calif.

Welcome to the committee, Mr. Sabatasso, we will begin with you.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS SABATASSO, PRESIDENT, SABATASSO'S PIZZA, SANTA ANA, CALIF.

Mr. Sabatasso. First of all, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to come here. I kind of want to give a different point of view than has been given so far relative to the business end of this problem. I would like to begin with the impact that the school lunch program has had on my business in particular. Like so many companies in this country, you know, you start off in a business and it is difficult to get started, and we found that about 8 years ago, when I went to a school show in Anaheim, Calif., pretty much by accident, and I took an 8-by-10 booth and started to display our wares, handing out pizza by the slice, and it was during the Easter vacation, and I was amazed when I got out of the show that from that point on we were selling about 30 school districts. I didn't realize the market was so tremendous. The result of that has been that my particular company has grown significantly. We are the present suppliers of school districts like Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Atlanta, Memphis, Detroit, even the school district that was mentioned by the gentleman from the PTA. The result of that has been, and I think this would be of some interest to Senator Hayakawa, since he is from our State, an increase in employment at Sabatasso's, in particular. We started as a two-man operation, and we now have 1,635 people working for us.

We were about to expand even further and put up a new bakery in Santa Ana, which would effectively employ another hundred people, but by virtue of the cutbacks in the President's programs, and we don't know really what the impact of 13 is going to be now in our State, and, of course, on the heels of that is proposition 9, so we have decided that we are going to take another look at our expansion program.

I guess basically what I am trying to say is that we feel that perhaps these cutbacks are going to somehow curtail the problem of inflation, or stop it, but as a businessman I can assure you it is going to cause inflation, not stop it. I don't see where this is going to benefit anyone at all, least of all our children.

I am concerned as a businessman, because I have a point of view there, but I am concerned not only for the health of the children, but the opportunity that businesses like mine have to provide for people who go to work and give them a sense of self-worth and give them an avenue for employment. We want to create taxpayers; we don't want people on our welfare rolls, and just looking at the business aspect of this, this is the kind of impact that these cutbacks are going to provide for the country. We have a concern for the business end of it, but as parents we are also concerned about the nutritional end of it, too.

I was in a Long Beach school a couple weeks ago with the director, and it was early in the morning and we were testing a new product, and there was a young child in line—this made an impact on me—that must have been 5 years old. He was having some difficulty with getting his breakfast, and Mr. Cohen, who was the director there, went up to the child and he was having trouble communicating with him. Another young fellow about 7 or 8 years old came up and said, "That is my little brother. He doesn't go to school here, but I bring him here every day to get his breakfast."

This child didn't even go to school there, and it was the only meal he was getting. I am continually amazed in going into school districts around the country where that kind of image exists. We say something that really makes a lot of sense. We say to many children in this country "Come for breakfast and stay for math."

There are children who wouldn't get out of bed in the morning if they weren't going to get that meal in school. I didn't believe it until I really got involved in it.

Again I think that you gentlemen have perhaps not heard the business end of this, and I think the impact on business is great. There are thousands of companies like my own.

I have continually been concerned about the school lunch around the country and I got together with some other manufacturers, brokers and distributors from around the country and started an organization called Project Smile.[1] At first our objective was to, in a sense, educate the public as to the true merits of the school lunch program and the necessity for it, but in view of these cutbacks that are coming down now, we have now more or less concentrated our effort into coming to you gentlemen in Washington and pointing out that in your wisdom and in your fight on hunger and the seed money that you have planted—some $2.3 million—in this child nutrition program, you have created a $10 billion industry. This industry, and I hate to say this, this industry could be destroyed in a very subtle way.

We have found that in raising the school lunch, and I see this all over the country, by raising it just a nickel there will be a 17-percent drop in participation. This is going to affect the entire food industry. Because I sell to the Los Angeles school district 14 million servings of pizza, this effectively reduces the price of my merchandise to everyone else I sell, including Disneyland and every Mom and Pop pizza operation and fast food operation, vending operation that I sell. Where am I going to go and find 14 million servings of a product, and that is just one school district. What about Houston, Dallas, Detroit, Chicago, New York? I can fill my trucks and send them across the country and keep my prices down. And with creating jobs, I think that is what is going to cut inflation.

There are some statistics on this that Mr. Goodman, who is a statistical man for Project Smile, will give you now. I just think that, as I said before, you planted the seed money and industry is now providing you with the fertilizer, and we have plenty of that. I think this program has grown immensely, and it is a tremendous program. It is a $10 billion industry. I would certainly hate to see anything happen to it.

---

[1] See p. 110.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you very much, Mr. Sabatasso. I think you have made some excellent points on the economics and business relevance of the school nutrition programs. It very definitely is large business now, and these cuts will impact on the economy, without question.

Mr. Goodman, why don't we hear from you now and then I will have a couple of questions.

STATEMENT OF CHIP GOODMAN, VICE PRESIDENT, LARRY'S FOOD PRODUCTS, GARDENIA, CALIF.

Mr. GOODMAN. Good morning. My name is Chip Goodman. I am vice president of marketing for Larry's Food Products, Inc. I am here today representing Project Smile, the School Meals Industry for Learning and Education. My own company, Larry's Food Products, is a family-owned frozen food processor located in Gardenia, Calif. We are, like thousands of other firms, vitally interested in the school service market and concerned about its future.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with members of my own California congressional delegation, including Senator Hayakawa, and others, as a representative of Project Smile. Without exception, I have been astounded to learn that the Members of Congress, by and large, have not been presented with a business perspective on Federal efforts in child nutrition. I feel there are two basic reasons for this:

First, during the decade from 1969 to 1979, all of us experienced very dynamic growth as a result of the increasing Federal commitment and seed money. Basically, everything was going our way. Although we were grateful, we did not pay a great deal of attention as to precisely where the money was coming from.

Second, another reason we have not been so vocal is because of the diversity of our industry. Most of us are small- or medium-sized privately owned processors, brokers, distributors, and equipment manufacturers. Companies of our size do not often enjoy the luxury of organized Washington representation. We should not ignore the fact that some Fortune 500 companies have also ventured into this market, because it is simply too large to ignore.

Through the Project Smile effort, I have found thousands of business people vitally interested in our effort.

As Project Smile's chairman of research data and statistics, I have developed some important information concerning our industry and the potential impact of various cuts in Federal spending for child nutrition programs.

Allow me first to position the size of our industry. Our company's story is typical. Larry's Food Products was founded in 1946 as a small entrepreneurial concern manufacturing fresh sandwiches for snack bars, drug stores, and other operations. We continued to grow and expand our markets. Our period of most dynamic growth occurred between the years 1969 and 1979. During that period we grew from approximately 80 employees to over 325 employees. Annual sales mushroomed from approximately $5 million to $35 million. We thought we were doing a very fine job in increasing our market share. I was recently quite disappointed to learn that basically all we did was keep pace with a very dynamic growing market in school food service.

Larry's and thousands of other firms grew at a very rapid rate during the 1969–79 period. Our growth can now be directly attributed to the Federal child nutrition effort and the war on hunger, and the long-term effort to improve the nutritional status of our Nation's children.

Well, a funny thing happened along the way: Federal cash payments, which increased steadily as the program was built, stimulated even more cash and substantial investment by the private sector, resulting in today's $10.1 billion market.

Allow me to relate to you some recent statistical information developed on the food service market in primary and secondary schools, developed by IFMA, International Foodservice Manufacturers Association.

Current status on the school food service markets:

One, rated on equivalent consumer expenditures (ECE), primary and secondary schools account for 8.8 percent, or $10.1 billion, of the $114 billion plus sales volume of the food service industry.

Two, primary and secondary schools operate food service programs at over 94,000 locations nationwide. They account for approximately 18 percent of all away-from-home food outlets in the United States.

Three, school food service is a labor efficient segment of the food service industry, producing 8.8 percent of the retail value (ECE) of food while employing only 4 percent of the industry operator employees, 325,000 of 8 million operator employees. This does not include thousands of private sector jobs for industry growers, processors, distributors, and sales agents who supply food to the $10 billion school food service market.

Four, $2.35 billion in Federal cash payments for schools as seed money generated $10.1 billion worth of business in primary and secondary schools. In other words, each Federal dollar spent generates over $3 in expenditures from other sources, primarily paying students purchasing breakfast, lunch, and a la carte items.

Senator McGovern. You say each Federal dollar generates three in the private sector?

Mr. Goodman. That is correct. I should qualify that to an extent. That is the retail value of the goods and services that are produced, and that is generated primarily by payments from paying students participating in the program, but there is, to a lesser extent, some local and State government money, as well. Basically, the ratio is $1 Federal to about $3.50 from other sources.

Senator Hayakawa. Explain for me how that works again. For each Federal dollar spent in support of the lunch program, there are——

Mr. Goodman. A $3.50 jump in after that is basically what it is.

Senator Hayakawa. That is, these dollars are from pupils who have their own money to spend?

Mr. Goodman. That is correct. That is the single largest source.

Senator Hayakawa. So that is, $1 billion generates ultimately $4½ billion?

Mr. **Goodman**. Right. In 1979 $2.35 billion was the total available cash payments from the Federal Government and the total market that resulted from that was $10.1 billion.

Senator **Hayakawa**. I just wanted to understand the bureaucracy of this sort of thing. In these school lunch programs, do certain students get their lunch free?

Mr. **Goodman**. Yes.

Senator **Hayakawa**. And who decides who this is?

Mr. **Goodman**. That depends on income eligibility guidelines, and that is one of the issues here.

Senator **Hayakawa**. Income eligibility guidelines established by?

Mr. **Goodman**. By the Federal Government.

Senator **Hayakawa**. And they are applied in the specific school situation by some officials of the school?

Mr. **Goodman**. Yes, sir.

What I would like to do, if I can go a bit further, I would like to explain where the guidelines fit in and how that affects the seed money.

Senator **Hayakawa**. All right.

Mr. **Goodman**. Five. To simply keep pace with the 1979 CPI Food Away From Home Index—11.2 percent—would require an increase in Federal expenditures for elementary and secondary school foodservice from $2.35 to $2.61 billion.

Six. The President's original budget called for a contemplated cut of $400 million, or an expenditure level of $1.95 billion. This would actually amount to a 25-percent reduction in Federal seed money, adjusted for 1979 inflation.

Here is the punch line: Based on the multiplier effect of Federal seed money, Project Smile projects that a cut of $400 million in Federal seed money would result in a reduction of the market from $10.1 to $8.3 billion, or a loss of $1.8 billion to the economy.

What's wrong with the administration's proposal?

You now know who we are, how we grew, and what our present predicament is. Allow me now to express some sympathy for your present predicament, that of weighing various priorities, economic and political impacts, and doing what must be done—balancing the Federal budget. Our group, Project Smile, has given careful consideration and analysis to the administration's proposed budget cuts. We feel that the proposals to reduce subsidies to paying children by 5 cents and to realize eligibility scales for free- and reduced-price meals are badly misguided.

We feel that the "nickel" upsets the delicate price/value relationship which induces the marginal paying student into participating in an important nutritional program. It is not simply the "nickel." Other costs such as increased food prices, labor, and energy will inevitably drive the price of a paid meal up 10 to 15 cents without the "nickel" cut in Federal subsidies. Even so, the lunch will maintain its price/value relationship to alternative purchases such as components for brown bag lunches.

If you upset that delicate balance by throwing an additional economic burden on the paying student, you will inevitably lower demand for the product. This is an absolute rule of a free marketplace. This will only serve to drive away the paying customers presently the backbone of child nutrition programs. The eventual result will be to change the program's complexion from a nutrition program into a welfare program, at a substantially higher Federal incremental cost per child fed.

Senator **McGovern**. Mr. Goodman, in that connection—obviously this is more of a kind of an intuition on my part than anything I have analyzed statistically—do you have the feeling or anything to back it up, when you refer to the delicate balance, that we are in a situation now where a lot of families, a lot of middle-class families are really right up to the wire and just a little extra push, another 5 cents worth here, and you have three or four children in school and their lunches all go up 5 cents per meal per day, that that may just be the straw that breaks the camel's back, so to speak?

Mr. **Goodman**. Senator, it is a textbook case. You can reduce it to a price elasticity test, really, and if the price of lunch goes up as a result of inflation, it will basically maintain its essential price/value relationship with other alternative means of eating, but if you throw that out of kilter by taking another 5 cents, which is not inflation induced, and, therefore, you are basically throwing the whole system out of whack and you upset whatever price/value relationship existed in the past, and we feel strongly that that will drive an awful lot of children away from the program.

The Federal dollars available to induce "paying students," including the "nickel," are the single most effective economic stimulus. These payments are actually the most efficient from a business standpoint, as they carry the greatest multiplier effect.

The proposed downward adjustment in the eligibility scales would have a similar effect and it is therefore the second least desirable cut in our view. Increasing the ranks of the "marginally able to pay" will inevitably result in a substantial number of consumers simply "going without."

I would like to offer some alternatives:

While in Washington, one quickly develops an appreciation of the difficult circumstances surrounding the "balanced budget" issue. For this reason, Project Smile has given very careful consideration and analysis to alternative cuts which would have the least destructive effect on our market. They are as follows:

A. Reduce special milk program subsidies to paying students from approximately 8.5 cents to 5 cents per unit, a savings of $55 million.

B. Change the food-away-from-home escalator to an annual rather than a semiannual basis, a savings of $100 million.

C. Eliminate private summer program vendors doing business with large private agency sponsors, a savings of $45 million.

D. Lower payments for reduced-price lunches to a uniform standard of 20 cents below the payment for free lunches, a savings of $35 million.

E. Eliminate nutrition studies, not NET, a savings of $3.5 million.

F. Reduce State administrative expense as projected, based on the above cuts, a savings of $6.4 million, and, finally, reduce expenditures for equipment, a savings of $5 million. The total savings of these proposed cuts is approximately $250 million. These we feel would be just about the worse we could stand without substantial economic damage.

G. Reduce expenditures for equipment ($5 million).

Total savings: Approximately $250 million.

One last comment: Another way to save the school's food cost dollars is to undertake administrative policies which foster more private sector competition in the school food service business. Although some slow progress has already been made, a new effort to clear away lengthy, ambiguous, and often contradictory regulations would lead to substantial food cost savings. My company and perhaps Project Smile will be making some administrative and possible legislative proposals in that regard in the near future.

In summary, let me say that any cuts shall have to be considered with the private sector business viewpoint in mind. We feel the "nickel" and realinement of eligibility scales are the two most destructive cuts that are presently contemplated. We have proposed some realistic alternatives which would have the least damaging, long-term effects on our industry. We hope the Congress will consider the more productivity-oriented proposals without dismantling our industry.

I thank you for your time and consideration. We remain hopeful that some sense of reasonableness will prevail.

Senator McGOVERN. The problem we are up against, Mr. Goodman—I think some of these recommendations you state are probably the ones that most feasibly could be made, but as our own figures show, they total $350 million in cuts, and we have a Senate Budget Committee resolution saying we have to cut a half billion. Everybody's figures here this morning come up about halfway to what we are faced with. I don't mean I dispute that—I think it is going to be hard to go much beyond the kind of cuts that you and Ms. Wynn and Ms. Bode and others have recommended, but what that means is that we have to fight with the Budget Committee, as well as with the administration.

Mr. GOODMAN. Senator, I don't agree with the administration's arithmetic at all. They are proposing cuts initially of $400 million, of a half million dollars, as if they would be actual savings to the Federal Government. I strongly dispute that because of the economic loss and the resultant lowering of the size of the market. They have to do some arithmetic that shows they have a substantial revenue loss there, as well, and the true savings is nowhere near what they are approximating. We are going from a productive economy to a nonproductive economy, and there are a lot of hidden costs they are not considering.

Senator McGOVERN. It is interesting that way back when the school lunch program was first getting started it was seen as a device to strengthen the agricultural economy. That was the origin of it. It didn't have a humanitarian or health origin. Originally it came out of the Agriculture Committee because we were trying to do something to help farmers.

Mr. GOODMAN. It is more than farmers; it is processors, distributors, brokers.

Senator McGOVERN. I think you have made a good case here that it contributes very definitely to the whole food industry, but the fact is farm prices are down. Practically all farm prices are off from 12 to 15 percent from where they were a year ago, so that while the rest of the economy is inflated, cattle and hog prices are down, soybeans are down, all the grain products are down, and about the only thing that seems to be doing pretty well are the dairy programs, but if your figures are right, and I have no reason to doubt them, that this kind of cut is going to take a couple billion dollars out of the food economy, and that impacts all of the way down to the farmer.

Mr. GOODMAN. That is right. That is only going to aggravate the situation as far as farm economy is concerned.

Mr. SABATASSO. In our own State, it is $154 million as a loss in income.

Senator HAYAKAWA. Would you explain item C, eliminate private summer program vendors doing business with large private agency sponsors?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. That is a proposal that was made last year and has been advanced again by the administration. I can tell you, Senator——

Senator HAYAKAWA. Who are "they"?

Mr. GOODMAN. Well, we are one of them. Our company has been involved as a private vendor, a private vending company, supplying food to the summer food vending program, and we have for the past 6 years. I regret to say that due to some administrative difficulties associated with the program that we will not participate again this year.

Senator HAYAKAWA. Are these summer food programs subsidized the same way as the regular school program?

Mr. GOODMAN. In a similar fashion, yes, sir. Basically, what I would like to say about eliminating private vendors doing business with private agencies, and I certainly have no problem with private vendors doing business with public agencies, that there is just an awful lot of room for error there, and we have seen that program abused time and time again.

Senator HAYAKAWA. That is the summer program?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes, by competitors of mine. It has been a great satisfaction to do it right, but it is a very, very difficult job to do, and that is the reason we have yielded on that point.

Senator McGOVERN. That seems to be the one program, the summer feeding program, where we have had consistent charges of fraud and failure to deliver. It is one that I think could be a very valuable program, but it is a question that that is the one that has caused more bad newsstories.

Mr. GOODMAN. That is exactly right, and really it is a difficult situation because some of those kids are in the greatest need, obviously, but some of that publicity has tainted the whole spectrum of the child nutrition programs. It is a very difficult choice. We have to make it as a company because we are involved in both.

I have one final suggestion and that is one that hasn't been brought up thus far, that we take a look at some of the administrative regulations associated with the food products over in USDA and take a look at the meal patterns and requirements, some of the pages and pages of regulations, and see if we can't effect a little bit of decontrol there and encourage a greater degree of competition among processors like ourselves, and the schools would enjoy, perhaps, the benefit of more favorable food costs.

Senator HAYAKAWA. That item is not in your statement.

Mr. **Goodman**. It is mentioned in passing in the statement, that we hope our organization might come up with some administrative or legislative proposals in that regard. It is on the second to the last page. I think that is an area that could be worked on, and there could be some savings there.

Senator **Hayakawa**. This is something I would like to hear more about.

Mr. **Goodman**. I can tell you that, being around the school lunch program for 8 years full time, that although there are well-meaning and well-intentioned people in USDA writing regulations, they do not often consider the industry viewpoint. Often they will ignore the benefit of new technologies and those types of things that our industry has developed, and they will apply 35-year-old standards to the modern products, and I think again if we could take a hard look at some of those regulations and if we could rewrite some of them, such as to foster more competition, I think schools would be the benefactors of that.

Senator **McGovern**. It might be useful if you could send us a followup letter on that, Mr. Goodman, and any recommendations that you have for simplifying the program, giving a little more flexibility to the program.

Mr. **Goodman**. More flexibility and a greater degree of competition.

Senator **Hayakawa**. I would be grateful for that, too, Mr. Goodman.

Mr. **Goodman**. I would be very happy to followup on that.

Senator **McGovern**. Mr. Goodman, you might also consider giving us a followup statement on the rationale of how you arrived at the multiplier effect that produces almost a $2 billion loss in terms of the economy.

Mr. **Goodman**. I have detailed it on a State-by-State basis for you.[1] I hope you can share that with some of your colleagues.

Senator **McGovern**. We will make the whole statement a matter of record.

Mr. **Goodman**. As you can see, for example, a potential reduction in the size of markets by $145 million, that would hurt.

Senator **McGovern**. Do you have any further questions?

Senator **Hayakawa**. I would have if I had time to read the statement. Just explain to me that line about California, will you?

Senator **McGovern**. In other words, how do you get to that.

Mr. **Goodman**. We took the total of the cash payments that are available under fiscal year 1979, which was the latest year we had figures for——

Senator **Hayakawa**. That would be the $209 million?

Mr. **Goodman**. Right, and again the International Foodservice Manufacturers Association, which is a very reputable Chicago based research concern, estimated that in California the entire foodservice market in elementary and secondary schools is approximately $900,188,000, based on the multiplier effect. We are talking about reduced seed money of $173 million and that would result in——

Senator **Hayakawa**. Reduced seed money of $173 million, and that is out of the $209 million?

---

[1] See p. 111.

Mr. GOODMAN. That is correct, and that is based on the administration's first round of $400 million in cuts, so again we are talking maybe less severe or more severe cuts.

Senator HAYAKAWA. In case of such reductions being made, and the estimated——

Mr. GOODMAN. That would be, again, based on the same multiplier effect. If you accept the premise that the Federal money generates economic activity in that State and among the schools, when utilizing the same multiplier of, roughly, 3.5, that is what we project would be the size of the market with $173 million seed money.

Senator HAYAKAWA. So instead of the $900 million market, you have a $745 million market?

Mr. GOODMAN. That is our projection, yes, sir.

Senator HAYAKAWA. And you have lost $400-some million?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes.

Mr. SABATASSO. In addition to additional jobs.

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes, and again that is why I dispute the administration's arithmetic, because they are talking about savings and fail to take into account their revenue loss as a result of the reduction in the size of the market.

Senator HAYAKAWA. They do that very often.

What is ECE?

Mr. GOODMAN. ECE stands for equivalent consumer expenditures. It is a measure of retail value of foods and services.

Senator HAYAKAWA. Thank you.

Senator MCGOVERN. Thank you very much for your testimony, gentlemen. We appreciate it.

Our next panel is the school breakfast program panel, Peter Ryersbach, director of Bread and Law Task Force, Montpelier, Vt.; John Carland, Kansas Child Nutrition Project, Kansas City, Kans.; Brenda Lucas, Head Start Mother of Baltimore, Md., and Gail Byrd, community food and nutrition program coordinator, Arkansas State CAP Directors Association, Little Rock, Ark., accompanied by Edward Cooney of the Food Research and Action Center.

You folks may proceed in any way you see fit.

STATEMENT OF PETER RYERSBACH, DIRECTOR, BREAD AND LAW TASK FORCE, MONTPELIER, VT.

Mr. RYERSBACH. My name is Peter Ryersbach and I am the director of the Bread and Law Task Force in Montpelier, Vt. Bread and Law Task Force is a statewide social agency that works with food programs for Vermont's poor. Our aim is to secure an adequate diet for all of Vermont's poor.

The actions of this Congress are making our task harder every day. I know that a balanced budget is of utmost importance to the President and to the Congress. But surely the minds that are assembled in this Nation's Capital must be able to balance the budget without extracting the food from the mouths of our poor, our elderly, our handicapped, and our children. Although I am here to testify on the breakfast program, I must go off on a slight tangent since most of the food programs this committee has authority over are so interrelated. You gentlemen know that the benefits of the food stamp program are based on the thrifty food plan, a diet sufficient to keep a person from starving to death, but not adequate enough to help an adult or child perform at his or her best level.

Most Americans don't know this, including State legislators. In Vermont, just this year, the State legislators working with a $20 million surplus did not see fit to increase welfare benefits more than 6 percent. Part of the reasoning for this action was based on the argument that welfare families get extra help from other programs, such as food stamps. So a welfare family of four in Vermont now gets $7.50 a day for food, coupled with approximately an additional $4 a day in food stamp benefits. Hence, this household's food budget is less than a dollar a meal per person. It is interesting to note that these same legislators felt they could exist on $17.50 a day for food and therefore gave themselves a 14-percent food allowace increase to $20 per day. For some reason Vermont legislators need $6.74 a meal per person, whereas they feel the poor can survive on less than a dollar a meal per person.

This same attitude seems to be reaching into our Federal Government as well. This puzzles me because I feel that the Congress knows how important school meals are as a supplement to a poor family's income. Surely Congress felt this way when the summer food program started. Congress realized that a lot of children were not eating adequate lunches while school was closed for summer vacation. Congress saw that even with the aid of other food programs, America's poor, working and nonworking, could not afford to feed lunch to their children during the summer, and Congress was right. The summer food program is an excellent, urgently needed and totally underutilized program that got a bad reputation because of a few greedy vendors. Of course, the vendors didn't suffer by their greed; the poor did, because of the bad press surrounding their program.

Why this long tangent? Because in this time of budget cutting I am going to ask Congress to expand its commitment to the school breakfast program. If many of the proposed budget cuts to the food stamp program and school lunch program become effective, the poor are going to need the breakfast program even more than before. I hope you agree with me and support the idea that school meals are not a duplicate service to the food stamp program. With all due respect to Senator Helms, I hope the Senate will not endorse his amendment to reduce food stamp benefits to families with children living in a school district that operates a school lunch program. Such an amendment would be devastating to the food budget of the poor. I hope you realize that by offering such budget cuts as changing the semiannual cost of living index to an annual cost of living index or reducing the reimbursement rate for a school lunch or breakfast, you will be almost stopping the school breakfast program dead in its tracks and you will initiate the decline of the lunch program. School administrators, school boards, and parent/teacher groups are not going to commit themselves to a program that they feel the Congress isn't committed to. The State of Maine has a school lunch mandate. If Congress changes reimbursement formulas, resulting in a decrease of income to school districts from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, there are fears that Maine legislators will remove the mandate and many schools will drop out of the program. School boards in States without mandates will withdraw from school lunch and school breakfast programs if they feel it is going to cost their already overtaxed communities too much. In addition, school administrators and school boards will not even give the school breakfast program a chance, not wishing to take on another financial burden.

This is already happening. In our efforts to increase school breakfast participation in Vermont schools under a special USDA breakfast expansion grant, Bread and Law has already found the attitude of "let's wait and see what Congress does before we even begin to think about the breakfast program in our school." We are asked by some school administrators if we can guarantee continued support by Congress. Prior to this year, we could have shown a history of steady support, and I hope this year we can continue to show our communities even stronger congressional support.

My agency has spent a lot of time studying the need for school breakfast. We have found that the once typical family with a working father, a wife who is a full-time homemaker, and two children accounts for only 7 percent of today's married families. We have found the number of children living only with their mother increased 80 percent between 1960 and 1973 and 60 percent of these households are living below the poverty level. We found that less than 40,000 Vermont women 16 years old or older worked in 1950, whereas in 1978 the work force had over 102,000 Vermont women employed.

We are living in a changing society, as the above statistics idicate. The increase of single parent households and households with both parents working, coupled with inflation, increased poverty and poor nutrition education on the part of all Americans have contributed to the fact established by HEW that approximately one-fourth of our children go to school without a breakfast and the fact established by AMA that only one out of five Americans eats an adequate breakfast.

What are we doing to our children by not providing them with the opportunity to have an adequate breakfast? And what are we doing to the future of our society?

I urge Congress to continue with full support of the breakfast program, to continue with semiannual cost of living updates on reimbursement rates. I urge Congress to instruct USDA to continue with commodity support of school breakfast. I urge Congress to accept the local option to initiate a school breakfast program as recommended by the National Anti-Hunger Coalition. The local option approach would require schools with at least 25 percent of the students receiving free or reduced school lunches to initiate a breakfast program if parents so decide. The local option approach simply involves developing a nationally uniformed, nonbiased questionnaire that would be drafted and sent out yearly to parents with the application form for free and reduced lunches. I also urge Congress to provide financial incentives for school systems in impoverished areas by permitting all schools in a district to receive "severe need" reimbursement if (1) 40 percent or more of the school lunches served in the district were free or reduced, (2) the regular reimbursement rate is inadequate and (3) that all the schools in the district with 25 percent of the lunches served at the free or reduced price already serve the breakfast program. I am asking Congress to support and expand this vitally needed program for our Nation's children, so that local communities can feel confident in doing the same.

Some of my friends think it is foolish to testify for increased benefits in this year of billion dollar cuts. I don't think it is foolish because I strongly feel that Congress can't cut these vital food programs to our Nation's poor and our Nation's children. However, if Congress does decide to balance the Federal budget by cutting vital food programs to the poor, at least after all is said and done they can't claim no one ever tried to tell them how important the school breakfast program is to our children and our society.

Thank you very much for your time.

Senator McGOVERN. Thank you very much, Mr. Ryersbach.

Senator Dole, would you present the next witness, please.

Senator DOLE. John Carland, from the Kansas child nutrition project. The witness list has it as John Carlin. John Carlin was our Governor, and maybe this John may be Governor some day.

We are very happy to have you here.

Mr. CARLAND. The name does help me to get through the State agencies quickly.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CARLAND, KANSAS CHILD NUTRITION PROJECT, KANSAS CITY, KANS.

Mr. CARLAND. Mr. Chairman, Senator, I am the director of the Kansas child nutrition project. We have been working in the State of Kansas since May of 1978 to expand the use of the school breakfast program. In order to accomplish this, we have recruited volunteers in selected areas of the State to form local school breakfast committees. We have to rely on volunteers a great deal because our staff for the expansion of the school breakfast program consists of myself and a part-time secretary, so we do have to have volunteers.

The goal of these committees is to inform the general public of the availability of the school breakfast program and to seek their support in the establishment of a program in their community. Unfortunately, many parents in Kansas and throughout the country don't know of the school breakfast program. I know this firsthand because I have talked to many of them. The first major task of these committees is to inform parents and other citizens of the basic facts about school breakfast and the availability of the program. We do this through public meetings, addressing community organizations, and by using public service announcements in the various media. The committees also organize petition drives, letter campaigns and telephone campaigns, to solicit support for school breakfast. In spite of our efforts and the efforts of other advocacy groups, the expansion of the program has been extremely slow. As I see it, there are two major barriers to expansion in Kansas, and probably across the country.

The first one I want to talk about is school administrators fear that the district will lose money by operating the program. In Columbus, Kans., for example, I spoke to the superintendent and he acknowledged a need for the program, but was concerned that the reimbursements would fail to cover the cost. Therefore he was opposed to it.

In Independence and Chanute, Kans., the school superintendents stated that they had no objections to initiating the breakfast program if they had assurances that the district would not lose money by doing so. With inflation at 18 percent, these administrators have a legitimate concern. Their fears, however, are keeping thousands of children from participating in school breakfast.

The poverty rate in the towns I mentioned averages about 17 percent. I might add that the unemployment rate is much lower, around 4 or 5 percent, so you have a lot of working poor in these communities. Nearly 30 percent of the students in these towns qualify for free meals. This situation exists in other Kansas towns and is not uncommon to the rest of the country. As inflation continues to deplete the resources of America's families, it is also inhibiting administrators from initiating school breakfast programs. The end result is that the nutritional needs of many school children are not being met.

I feel that additional financial assistance should be made available to needy schools. This would ease the minds of cost-conscious administrators and remove a major stumbling block to the expansion of the breakfast program.

The second major obstacle to breakfast expansion is the attitude of some school boards and administrators that breakfast does not belong in the schools. I would like to point out at this time that district superintendents and school boards make decisions that affect all the schools under their jurisdiction. There are many parents in communities throughout Kansas who have spent a great deal of time and energy working to get school breakfast in their community only to be turned down by an unsympathetic school board.

I want to give you one quick example of this situation. Last week a questionnaire was sent out to parents of school children in Kansas City, Kans., school district asking if they would like a school breakfast program in their school. Of the 171 responses received so far, 165 have indicated that they would like a breakfast program in their school. The school board and superintendent in Kansas City, Kans., are strongly opposed to the school breakfast, and it is unlikely that they will approve of initiating a program even though the parents in this district seem to strongly support the school breakfast program. If a school board says no to school breakfast, it is denying the availability of the program to every school in that district without regard to the individual needs of each school. In many cases the desires and needs of parents, children, and even school principals are being ignored at the district level.

I would like to cite a couple other quick examples. In Wichita, Kans., the city which has recently been hit by layoffs from the aircraft industry, the principals of two elementary schools went to the local school board and requested that they be allowed to start a breakfast program. The principals assured the board that all the details had been worked out and that there was a definite need for the program. Both of these schools meet the criteria for severe need schools. The board denied their request.

In Kansas City, again, as I said, the superintendent in the district exerts a great deal of influence on the school board, and he is not supportive of the school breakfast program.

I spoke with advocates last year and they informed me that it took 3 years of intensive lobbying to get special milk in the school. Our project has held many public meetings in Kansas City in the past year and I found that a large majority of the parents and students in that district support and desire a school breakfast program.

Earlier this week I spoke with the assistant director of the State of Kansas food service section of the department of education. She informed me that several principals were interested in the school breakfast program in Kansas City. Barring some unforeseen change in attitude of the superintendent and school board, these schools will not be allowed to start the program. More than 50 percent of the schools in that district are severe-need schools. In Kansas the severe-need criterion is 40 percent or more participating in free or reduced price. In some of the schools in Kansas, more than 90 percent of the students are eating at a free or reduced price.

Similar situations exist in other towns in Kansas, and judging from communications I have had with other food advocates across the country, this problem is widespread.

Now, it is not uncommon for school officials to be hesitant about initiating a school breakfast program. In Kansas towns, where school breakfast now enjoys acceptance and success, school officials initially had reservations about the program. But once administrators, school board members, and teachers in Topeka, Fort Scott, Pittsburg, and other Kansas communities saw first hand the benefits of the program, school breakfast became greatly appreciated.

It is apparent to me that the nutritional needs of many school children in Kansas are not being met, and that the school breakfast program, if utilized, could benefit these children greatly. I also feel that in many cases school districts and school officials do not act in the best interest of the people in the district because they fail to recognize interests of all people in the district and they fail to recognize and act on the needs of neighborhoods served by individual schools.

I believe that the decision to participate in the school breakfast program should be left to those people who are most greatly affected by the program. These people are the parents of the students in the neighborhood served by the individual school. These parents know better than any school official could possibly know whether or not their children need and would use the school breakfast program. These parents have the right to make a decision that could have such a profound effect on the lives of their children.

One of the most frustrating moments I have experienced in working to expand the breakfast program came last year in Kansas City. Following my presentation, a parent stood and said, "Look, we know our kids need a breakfast program, but what can we do? We're just people. We don't have any influence. Nobody listens to us."

I sincerely hope that this committee sees fit to approve the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1980 so that the school breakfast program can expand to meet the nutritional needs of our schoolchildren, and that parents be given the opportunity to make the decision to have the breakfast program based on the needs of their neighborhood school.

Thank you.

Senator McGovern. Thank you very much, Mr. Carland.

Members of the committee and witnesses, the Foreign Relations Committee has been meeting since 10 o'clock this morning and I want to make a brief appearance there before they adjourn, so Senator Dole has agreed to preside for the balance of the hearing. I will turn the gavel over to him.

[Senator Dole assumed the chair.]

Senator Dole. Brenda Lucas, Head Start mother, from Baltimore, Md.

STATEMENT OF BRENDA LUCAS, HEAD START MOTHER, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mrs. Lucas. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Brenda Lucas. I am pleased to be here today to talk to you about the school breakfast program. I think that the school breakfast program is a good way to improve the nutrition and health of my children and my neighbors' children. I am concerned that many children in Maryland are not able to get a morning breakfast because their schools do not have a breakfast program.

I know the value of good nutrition and health. I am a member of the Health Advisory Committee of our local Head Start program, and an active member of the WIC program in Baltimore, where I am helping to form a participants' advisory group. My first born died and later I joined the WIC program and discovered what good nutrition is all about. My next four children have all been healthy, so I know personally the importance of good nutrition and health.

I also know that a hungry child cannot learn. My children have to walk 10 to 15 blocks before they reach school. This requires energy, which can only be supplied by food. Many low-income parents simply do not have all the funds they need to provide for housing, health, clothes, and food. My kids told me that they feel better off when they have nice clothes and if they have to give something up, they could eat less food. And, of course, I know that this is wrong. Adults start their day with coffee breaks and snacks. We should recognize that kids are people, too, and they need the energy supplied by a decent breakfast at school. A well balanced breakfast will make a well balanced mind. This approach will help to keep kids in school longer and not have so many children repeating grades. Can we afford the extra tax dollars and loss of human potential to the community?

My daughter's school has a lunch and a breakfast program, but my son's school only has a lunch program. These schools are only six blocks apart. Do the children in one school need a breakfast more than the children in another school? This seems strange when the entire community has so little money.

I am trying to do something to correct this situation. I am a volunteer with the Maryland Food Committee. This group recently was successful in organizing a group of parents and community agencies to advocate a State requirement to expand the breakfast program. After 3 years of work the group was successful in getting the Maryland Legislature to pass a breakfast requirement. We decided that we needed a requirement because school superintendents did not want to deal with the fact that children needed a good breakfast at school, and they were very powerful. These individuals simply did not see any relation between nutrition and education.

The Maryland Food Committee and the other groups were successful in getting a requirement to expand the school breakfast program. But the requirement only applied to title I schools or schools that offer a nutrition education program. I am happy that we now have breakfast available to some children, but I know that there are many poor children who are not in title I schools. I also know that some school officials will try to substitute a nutrition education program for a breakfast program. I am all for nutrition education, but you cannot eat words. These schools need help. When I was calling people for support of the Maryland breakfast requirement, people would ask me why has Congress not acted on expanding this program. It seems to me that a school board should not be allowed to let kids go to school hungry. People have told me that Congress passed the school lunch and breakfast legislation to protect the nutrition and health of all of our children. How can we do this if children can't get a breakfast at school?

I would like to urge you to consider a legislative requirement to expand the school breakfast program. I am familiar with the school breakfast local option approach suggested by the National Anti-Hunger Coalition. I like this way of expanding breakfast programs because it involves parents making decisions about their children's schools. It also does not limit any school from starting a breakfast program at any time, but it does say that school officials should not deny hungry children a school breakfast. I think this will help a lot of people in Maryland.

Thank you for the honor of giving this testimony.

I would just like to add, with due respect, that we must keep foremost in our mind that the child of today is our future leader. Our country was built from strong, healthy attitudes toward growth and development. Let us continue to replenish that supply.

I have one additional comment—I hope that it is in order—and that is, like I said, I am a parent and a recipient of the things that we are speaking of today. I have tried to digest as much as I could of Miss Wynn's comment about removing the guidelines from public knowledge. I can only say that our Government hides nothing, so I don't understand that particular effort or her suggestion for changing them, which would only put the middle income in a pressure position.

Mr. Goodman is asking the poor to save the program, which again falls back on us to make self-sacrifices. I am going to drop a bomb, per se, because some people here seem to be lighting a fuse, waiting for the end result and before our children go forth for education hungry, 180 days of the year, I would prefer my children attend 179 nourished days and maybe in this way, going across the country, you could come up with the nickels and dimes that were suggested here to help with whatever this cut needs to be.

Thank you, again, for the honor of giving this testimony.

Senator Dole. Thank you. We will have some questions later.

Senator Hayakawa.

Senator **Hayakawa**. I would like to apologize to the witnesses, Mr. Chairman, but I must ask that you excuse me. I have an appointment in my office at 11:30. I have explained to the witnesses that the normal program is for all of us in the Senate to have two, three, or four engagements at once.

I am grateful for your testimony. I am sorry that I will not have the chance to discuss this with you. I will ask you to excuse me.

Senator **Dole**. I think Senator Hayakawa has a point. I just left the refugee hearings and they have problems, too. You have been reading in the paper about the Haitian refugees and Cuban refugees and some others, and all of them involve more money. It is not just nickels and dimes we are talking about, but bankrupt America.

Senator **Hayakawa**. We are always shifting gears, from school lunch to Haitian refugees to Afghanistan, to Iran, agriculture and pesticides, to taxation and budgets. I guess my brains are all scrambled.

Senator **Dole**. Gale Byrd, community food and nutrition program coordinator, Arkansas State CAP Directors Association, Little Rock, Ark.

STATEMENT OF GALE BYRD, DIRECTOR, ARKANSAS NUTRITION PROJECT, ARKANSAS COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Ms **Byrd**. I am Gale Byrd, director of the Arkansas nutrition project, which is a statewide program, an antihunger group in Arkansas. This project is sponsored by the Arkansas Community Action Agencies and funded through the community food and nutrition program of the Community Services Administration.

I also serve as a regional representative for the National Anti-Hunger Coalition, which is composed of hundreds of individuals who are concerned about the nutritional well-being of our Nation's poor.

The overall goal of my project and of the community action agencies is to see that people in Arkansas do not go to bed hungry. Toward that end, we actively advocate for the federally funded feeding programs such as food stamps, WIC, and school meals.

I would like to say that contrary to some published rumors, Arkansas does indeed exist. That cryptic remark refers to the fact that we understand there is a group in Phoenix, Ariz., that is trying to send us refunds and the money keeps going back. We are there. In fact, some people in Washington have said, "You are the first people we ever met from that State. We didn't know you were there." We gave a few hog calls and now they know we're there.

It is a beautiful State, but has one of every four citizens living in poverty. With a population of approximately 2 million, Arkansas has over 500,000 people who meet the Federal poverty guidelines. Arkansas, which consistently ranks 49th in per capita income, ranks 41st in its utilization of the Federal programs designed to help alleviate the problems of poverty.

Children, as well as adults, suffer from this lack of response to federally funded programs. I am referring to the lack of meaningful expansion of the school breakfast program.

Last year only 11 school breakfast programs were started in Arkansas. While all schools but one in the State serve school lunch, only 39 percent of these schools serve school breakfast. That means over 223,000 free or reduced price eligible children in 671 schools are being denied a school breakfast.

I would also point out that 25 percent of these schools have 70 percent or more free or reduced price eligible children.

The lack of expansion of these programs in Arkansas I believe result from two basic reasons:

One, few people know about the program and its benefits to all children and two, school administrators do not support the program.

People, especially parents, don't know about the program because USDA and the Arkansas Department of Education has failed to inform the general public about it. There seems to be an appalling lack of interest at the State level in expanding a program that is a necessary response to the social realities of American life and a service to parents, as well.

The second stumbling block to meaningful expansion of school breakfast in Arkansas is a resistance from school administrators to the program. This resistance comes from a belief by many principals and school boards that schools should not feed children breakfast, that parents should. I have no problem with that statement. However, believing that statement doesn't necessarily make it happen. Additionally, school administrators are reluctant to initiate a new program at a time when in an election year Congress is more concerned with winning reelection than feeding hungry children.

I would also like to state that we are talking about generating funds for a very poor State. Last year the school breakfast program generated over $4 million in Arkansas alone.

I believe at least two things must happen before there will be a meaningful expansion in the school breakfast program in Arkansas:

First of all, outreach regulations must be strengthened for State guidance plans. States should be required to identify by name and location schools that are targeted for expansion. This would assist advocates such as myself in helping the department of education work with schools in starting programs. It is very frustrating to know that there are schools out there targeted for expansion, but the department of education won't identify them. States should be required to utilize other groups who are concerned about feeding children, such as community action agencies, PTA's, church antihunger groups, teachers, future teachers, and especially parents. I was a little appalled to hear that the PTA might like to see school breakfast go before other cuts, because I feel it is very important.

Second, Congress must make a strong commitment, including sufficient moneys, to the school meal programs. School administrators will not initiate new programs that are not adequately funded. Reimbursement rates must be high enough to cover the cost of this program. Another incentive that could be added would be the commitment of commodities for the breakfast program.

As a former teacher, I can attest to the need for school breakfast. As a former recipient of the school lunch program myself, I can testify to the effectiveness of the school meal program. I didn't get school breakfast because it was not offered when I went to school. Nick Kotz, author of "Let Them Eat Promises," said "the entitlement of all needy Americans to an adequate diet is a goal that is within our capacity, if only we reach for it." I submit to you that Americans out there are reaching for that program, for that goal. I am only asking this committee to give them the tools necessary to put that goal within their reach.

I would like to thank you for the past commitment that you have shown to such a program. Please keep it up. Thank you.

Senator Dole. Senator McGovern had some questions that he wanted answered for the record, and I will ask them for him. We also have additional witnesses, and we must conclude this by noon.

I would say, first of all, as one who has been a supporter of most of the programs, I think we also have to understand the obligation of parents. It is easy to come here and talk about the obligation of Congress and obligation of the school board and obligations of everyone but the parents, and I hope that we don't lose sight of the parental responsibility in all of the good things that we talk about when we come before a committee asking for additional funds, and I am not so certain it is being cut back because members are running for reelection. That may be partly the problem, but unless we can have some efforts to balance the budget in the country, we are not going to have any programs, whether in schools or outside schools. We are on the verge of collapse in this country, and I trust that that is also a consideration.

Mr. Cooney, you didn't make a statement, but Senator McGovern wanted me to find out for the record how many schools have the breakfast program now and what has been the rate of expansion. Do you have that information?

Mr. Cooney. Yes, I do, Senator. Essentially, there are approximately 27 million children in the school lunch program currently. About 3.5 million children are in the breakfast program. If you took a look at that population to see who was who, about 12.1 million of the children in the lunch program currently receive a free- or reduced-cost lunch. In the breakfast program, that is about 3 million kids.

If you take a look at the rate of expansion—the latest USDA figures are the ones that compare October 1978 to October 1979—you would find about 200,000 children were added to the program in that one year. At this rate of expansion, it would take approximately 40 years for it to reach the same number of kids that are qualified now for free- or reduced-cost lunch in order to give them breakfast. If you were looking at the total universe of children in the program, it would take 120 years.

The problem we face is that some administrators are willing to wait, but those give you a sense of where the figures are.

Senator Dole. What would it cost if they were all in the breakfast program? Nobody ever mentioned cost.

Mr. Cooney. I think the total cost of the school program is something like $3.2 billion. If you were to have everybody in the program, and you are talking about the universe as to the breakfast program?

Senator Dole. Right, if everybody in the lunch program were in the breakfast program, what would it cost.

Mr. Cooney. If that happened within 1 year, that would add a cost, and I don't have the exact figure, but we could get that information for the record. But to answer your question, the cost would be somewhat more substantial than what is being paid for now. We do not recommend that happen. We recommend that a requirement be introduced into legislation that these programs be introduced gradually. The requirement we recommend would involve no fiscal cost for next year because by the time the legislation has passed and there are published regulations, the implementation for breakfast requirement would not be until fiscal year 1982, so there would be no fiscal impact in 1981.

Senator Dole. Another question Senator McGovern had apparently been asking every witness, or most every witness, is if the cuts are going to be made, if they are as high as the $500 million recommended by the Senate Budget Committee, where would you make the cuts, and let me add, in addition to that, I am on the Finance Committee that deals with welfare and health care and a lot of other good programs and we are being asked to cut over $4 million in those programs and it is not easy. It is easier to spend money around here than to reduce spending, but if you had to cut $500 million, and the Budget Committee can almost mandate that because if it exceeds the budget outlines, we can't do anything, subject to a point of order, so if you cut $500 million, do you have a little laundry list we could put in the record?

Mr. Cooney. I would ask for help immediately from whoever I could get it from. We have heard the method of the members of the Anti-Hunger Coalition. There are 35 members that are regional representatives and the group also has 50 State coordinators. Many of these people were active when we had the National Child Nutrition Coalition and they acknowledged the past efforts that Senator McGovern and you, Senator Dole, as well as Senator Hayakawa, had made in passing those amendments. They do recognize times have changed. They have received a message from the Budget Committee and other committees that they must face what is called political reality. Unfortunately, the participants and many of the groups we work with return and say we can't eat political reality. The National Anti-Hunger Coalition, I polled the seven regional chairpeople and they do indicate for the record they are opposed to all of the cuts in the child nutrition programs, but they do have a sense of priorities. Those priorities begin with the eligibility standards for free meals. They feel that over 1.5 million of the children will be transferred out of that program into the reduced cost category, and they feel with the cuts in health and nutrition that the eligibility levels for free meals should not be reduced from 125 percent to 100 percent. They feel in the reduced price meal category you have to look at who are these people and what choices can they make. If you reduce that from 195 to 175 the children that are paying a dime currently for their meal will be paying 60 cents or more. We feel that is a serious problem.

One of the neediest areas is the summer food program, and there will be a panel discussing that, but essentially you will be cutting benefits from a child who during the school year gets lunch and now under the provisions of the administration, that the administration recommends, fully one-third of the program could be cut, and that means you don't solve fraud and abuse, but you do prevent kids from eating.

We feel this is a political cut and not substantiated by the record, and there will be a panel testifying on that. We feel similarly about the women's program that still fails to serve over three-quarters of the pregnant women and young children. We also are concerned about the nickel cut, but we recognize there is a difference between needy and nonneedy children.

Mrs. Wynn, from the American School Food Service Association pointed that out in her testimony, that there is this difference. We sympathize with each of the groups on these issues. We know if Congress cuts a nickel that they will be rejecting the statutory requirement to protect and safeguard health and nutrition of all children, but faced with a choice between needy and nonneedy children, we feel that to the extent possible we feel obligated to protect the needs of the needy.

Senator McGovern asked each panelist, I think, what is their response on an across-the-board cut in each of the free, paid, and reduced categories. We would be opposed to that cut unless it protected those schools with 25 percent or more needy children.

The special milk cut: Although we feel milk is important, it is a cut that is certainly not as adverse or would not be as adverse in its effect on the poor kids. We feel that is unfortunate, but those are our statements along those lines.

Senator Dole. I think if you have a more complete list and could furnish it for the record, it might be helpful. I am not sure what the cuts would add up to that you recommended.

Mr. Cooney. They would not equal $500 million.

Senator Dole. Well, keep working on it and we will keep working on ours.

Mr. Cooney. As a panelist, I would like to duck that question.

Senator Dole. I don't blame you.

Don't misunderstand me, I don't know how we are going to do it ourselves.

Mr. Ryersbach, in 1979 Senator Leahy introduced a proposal to require schools with 25 percent or more pupils in free and reduced categories to institute a breakfast program. How does your breakfast option compare to Senator Leahy's proposal and how do local officials react to breakfast option approach as compared to their reaction in 1979?

Mr. Ryersbach. I see a world of difference between the two. The option Senator Leahy introduced in 1978 was a mandate saying any school that had, I believe at that time, 25 percent free and reduced must initiate a school breakfast program. There was no question about it. It was the Federal Government telling the local government this is what you must do. The option that the National Anti-Hunger Coalition is proposing only says any school in this situation must provide the parents of that district the opportunity to decide for themselves if they want the breakfast program or not. It allows for a lot of interchange. If administrators don't like it, they can start campaigning against it. People that like it can start campaigning for it, and the choice then becomes local.

Senator **Dole**. Is there any doubt in your mind parents would vote down free breakfast?

Mr. **Ryersbach**. I think in some cases they would.

Senator **Dole**. You had six no's in Kansas.

Mr. **Carland**. I must say these questionnaires were sent to very low income areas and in these areas the parents in those schools served desperately need the breakfast program, so I wasn't surprised at that return. I know of many local schools, the parents in those schools, who would probably vote down the school breakfast. Within a district you find pockets of strong support for school breakfast and you find pockets of opposition within the same district. Within districts you find a wide range of views on school breakfast, so I think I would agree it needs to be looked at at the school level and a neighborhood level. I think it would get parents involved and administrators involved, so they could have a better understanding of the issues.

Right now it seems like the discussion only occurs at the district level and many parents feel that they have no influence at that level, so they don't even participate in the process of making that decision.

Senator **Dole**. I think you set out the difference and I think that is what Senator McGovern and our staff would want to know. I can see where it would be inequitable to vote it down, but it is still going to deprive some needy child breakfast. Either way you go, I assume there will be inequities.

Mrs. Lucas, how would a Federal breakfast option help Maryland in implementing its breakfast requirement, or will it hurt its implementation?

Mrs. **Lucas**. I feel the Federal Government issuing a requirement, that it would include all schools. At present at the local level it is only in title I schools, which are not all of the schools, and that is my reason for testifying today, to let them know it should be something available to all schools.

Senator **Dole**. I guess I could ask this of all, but I will direct it at Gale, and that is how do you improve the outreach and how do you insure that the State agencies and advocacy groups work together? Maybe they do in Arkansas. Everyone here has heard of Arkansas.

Ms. **Byrd**. Thank you. I have heard of Kansas.

Senator **Dole**. Right. We are pretty much the same.

Ms. **Byrd**. In Arkansas we do not work together. Now, the school officials are very nice, they are very polite. The State administrator is a very nice man who tells me if I have any comments to make, send them in writing and he will be glad to look at them. However, there are no public hearings, there is no input into a State plan from any of the people in the State, other than his staff.

I feel strongly in Arkansas that if other groups had input in the State plan, it would make it stronger. I also feel that if the State guidance plan required certain things of the States then their outreach would become more effective, such as involving community groups and letting them know about the programs, providing for workshops in the State plan. In the past year there were none of those things. They do not identify the schools, so we do not know the schools that are targeted. They targeted 35; they expanded 11.

To me right now there is no real outreach in Arkansas and there is none listed in their State plan either.

Senator DOLE. You might get one of your Senators to have hearings out there.

Ms. BYRD. I talked to one of them about that yesterday.

Senator DOLE. We are thinking about that in Kansas for a jobs program out there.

You mentioned in your statement, John, that there are a lot of obstacles. I don't know whether it is money or attitude. Which is the worst?

Mr. CARLAND. Both. I think attitude is the worst though. I think the attitude that it is the parent's responsibility, where school administrators say well, we are not in the restaurant business, so it is this kind of feeling at the district level that it just shouldn't be done in the schools.

Senator DOLE. How many schools have breakfast programs in Kansas, if you know?

Mr. CARLAND. About 195, I believe.

Senator DOLE. What percentage is that?

Mr. CARLAND. It is about 11 percent.

Senator DOLE. How much was the expansion last year?

Mr. CARLAND. It expanded to about 12—well, I am not sure of exactly the percentage, but there were 11 or 12 schools added. It was probably 1 or 2 percent—less than 1 percent.

Senator DOLE. What percent of the students in the one hundred-some schools participate?

Mr. CARLAND. I think the average participation is about 20 percent in the school breakfast program.

Senator DOLE. What percent of those are in or not in? Was it 95 and 5?

Mr. CARLAND. Right. The problem, as I see it, is that the schools, the school districts, the school boards, are not really being responsive to many parents within their district.

Like I said, there are small groups of people that are served by the schools that desperately want and need the program, but they are not being heard at the district level. I think that the local option would bring school breakfast to thousands of children. Maybe 10 years from now they will have it, but there is no guarantee of that. Growth is just too slow.

Senator DOLE. How is your project funded?

Mr. CARLAND. We are funded through a community service administration, the United Methodist Church, United Church of Christ, and United Presbyterian Church. We have funds from four different services.

Senator DOLE. Which provides the most?

Mr. CARLAND. CSA provides about 60 percent of that.

Senator DOLE. And you have a staff of one and a half?

Mr. CARLAND. Yes, working on school breakfast. We do have two other people working in the western part of the State on five other food programs, doing outreach work.

I might add, also, in the State of Kansas outreach, as far as the State department of education and food service section is concerned, they do conduct outreach, but it only reaches those people at the school district level. It reaches food service directors, superintendents, and employees in food service.

The commissioner of education, I met with him and asked that the school, that the department of education make a stronger outreach effort, and he said, "Well, we are not going to beat the bushes for school breakfast." The assistant commissioner stated flatly he didn't want to upset superintendents who are opposed to the breakfast program. It is understandable, being in their position, that they don't want to go in there and try to support superintendents to do this. Again, you know, the outreach reaches the district level. There are many parents who still don't know about school breakfast, so their needs to be some vehicle by which the local people can get involved in this decision.

Senator DOLE. I would think some day we would be able to get some of those superintendents where you have the breakfast program to be ambassadors. I am certain they are.

Mr. CARLAND. Yes, we have done that.

Senator DOLE. I am sorry to break up this little meeting, but we have two additional witnesses. I appreciate very much your testimony.

Jeanne Perry, chairperson, New York City Summer Food Program Coalition, and Ed Polk, executive director, Children's Rights Group, San Francisco.

I would ask that you sort of summarize your statement because I may run out of time and there won't be anybody here at all, and Senator McGovern wanted some questions answered for the record,[1] so your full statement will be made a part of the record and if you could just summarize it, it would be helpful. then we could ask the questions which I think would be pertinent for the record.

STATEMENT OF JEANNE PERRY, CHAIRPERSON, NEW YORK CITY SUMMER FOOD PROGRAM COALITION, AND STAFF PERSON, COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Miss PERRY. I am here today representing the Summer Meals Advisory Committee, of which I am chairperson. With me is John Cimarosa, the president of the Association for Recreation Management, a New York City based association of nonprofit agency summer camps.

I would like to spend this time addressing two specific issues of the administration bill. One is State against USDA administration, and the other is limitation on vendor programs. As background, I would like to mention a few relevant New York City statistics. One out of every four New York City children, or about 600,000 children, live in families which receive public assistance.

According to the most recent census data, over 1 million New York City children live in families with incomes under 195 percent of the poverty line. All of them are eligible for public service programs.

First of all, we urge the committee to support a provision which will allow the USDA to administer the program in States which are unwilling or unable to administer it themselves.

---

[1] See p. 112 for the prepared statement of Miss Perry.

We support the provision in the administration's bill which provides for additional administrative funds to be made available to States which can demonstrate need. We are concerned, however, that last-minute negotiations for these additional funds may impede timely and effective planning and administration of the program. Therefore, we urge that a formula be developed which would allow States to anticipate their costs early in the planning stages and receive a commitment from USDA to the specific amount of additional funds they would receive from a certain size program.

The second is the most important thing, and that is the limitation on vending programs of nonprofit sponsors. The proposed limitation to 15 sites and 1,500 meals on this type of sponsor would have a devastating impact on New York City.

In 1979, the New York City program served 278,000 lunches daily and most of those were in the category which would be affected by this program. There were 41 sponsors which served 137,000 lunches daily in 1979, and they would be limited to serving only 61,500 lunches under this provision.

I would like to point out that New York City was extremely underserved without this limitation, reaching less than one-third of the eligible children.

The proposed limitation would severely limit the options for program expansion in New York City.

These I have listed, with some explanation, as follows:

The New York City Board of Education is unable to absorb any costs related to this program. Because of the high fixed costs of opening a school building, what was a break-even participation rate of 400 children in each school in 1979 will become approximately 700 children per school in 1980. It is therefore unlikely that additional sites will be opened; instead the number of children at existing sites will have to be increased or these sites will be closed. The only children, therefore, to be reached in this option would be those who live near a school site which has already operated successful programs.

In New York City there has been no consistent involvement of public agencies, even when their participation has been actively solicited by the administering agency. There is no reason, therefore, to expect that this situation will change substantially.

Other self-prep sponsors: Self-preparation has only limited feasibility in New York City. The required facilities are virtually nonexistent in many of the poorest neighborhoods. Additionally, the New York City Health Department enforces a strict restaurant-type code which makes many makeshift arrangements unable to operate. Although we support the concept of self-preparation and encourage its expansion, its feasibility in terms of operation and administration, especially monitoring, is limited. This is especially true for large-scale funding.

Finally, there is the possibility there would be additional small vendor programs. In the last 2 years New York City has made an effort to weed out those sponsors which were unable or unwilling to operate successful programs. Those sponsors which have a proven track record have been encouraged to continue their involvement with the program. It would be extremely unfortunate to now limit those good sponsors to a number well below their proven capacity and to weigh them equally with the new, inexperienced groups.

We believe that new sponsors need the most support and help and that these should be limited in size. We also believe that once a sponsor has a demonstrated capacity, limitations below that are counterproductive.

We are concerned about reaching as many as possible of those million eligible children with wholesome food in an administratively sound manner. In New York City, this job could not be done without large-scale vendor programs. We urge you, therefore, to support a piece of legislation which addresses all of these concerns.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Senator DOLE. Let me just ask the question Senator McGovern wanted to ask for the record. I think we are all aware—certainly you are—of the many administrative problems we have had in some of the summer feeding programs. Do you think that, let's say, in New York City you have enough management controls that have been implemented in the last few years that has made the program free up some of the abuses, even from the larger sponsors?

Miss PERRY. I would like to say one thing quickly, and that is that I really believe that the efforts to cut back vending programs are really still a back lash to New York City's experience in 1976, and I think we have come a very long way toward correcting some of those things, and I am very hopeful that the 1980 program will be substantially improved over anything we have seen so far.

I would like John to describe some specifics.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CIMAROSA, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION FOR RECREATION MANAGEMENT, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

Mr. CIMAROSA. The most important single administrative changes have occurred for the first time in 5 or 6 years. The same people have been running the program 2 years straight. We have had a situation in New York where every year or every other year we have had a completely new cast of characters coming on the scene in February or March to run a program they really don't understand.

For 3 years USDA has operated a program in New York City and for the last 2 they have had the same permanent staff as the core. One of the concerns we have is we finally see some effect of the administration of the program, and now the administration bill would insist that the State take it over again or not have the program at all, and we are very fearful we will have another 2 years, at least, of confusion if that would occur while the State gets back into the picture and works out the money situation with USDA and all of the other problems they have. I don't think the administration bill addresses the concerns of the 20-odd States that have given the program back. Clearly money is one of them, but there are others.

This program has at its core flaws, if you will. One is the fact that we have an absolute limit on the number of meals that can be served at any given site, at any given time, which means any meal not served in that time becomes a menace—you can't give it away, you can't throw it away—what do you do with a meal if you have

100 meals at your site and 95 kids show up and there are 5 meals that are a scandal, according to the newspaper; it is a waste.

It is a very difficult problem, but yet it is a core part of the problem of the whole program, and nobody ever wants to address it, and I would submit certainly in New York, and I imagine other States, as well, that is one of the key issues so far as getting the State to reliably run the program.

Miss PERRY. And it is being addressed this year in our State management plan. The two aspects are being addressed. One is what has been, I think, a history of competition among vendors possibly for service for a large number of meals in a given area, and we have some community groups—not real community groups—that have come in as sponsors. Most of those have gone and we have developed a plan which makes it possible for one community agency with a reliable history to serve all meals in that area and I think that will go very far in eliminating the kind of abuse that has been pinpointed in this program.

The other thing is, on the point John just made about the number of meals, in New York City's management plan we have addressed that by allowing for some variation in the number of meals that will be given or will be delivered at a site on a given day, and I think that would go far to address the second major abuse in the program. I think it should be given a chance, and I think it is unfortunate for the rest of the country to be suffering from what was a very unique situation in one city for 1 year.

Senator DOLE. It may not have been unique.

Miss PERRY. I think it was.

Senator DOLE. Mr. Polk.

STATEMENT OF ED POLK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHILDREN'S RIGHTS GROUP, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. POLK. My name is Ed Polk, Mr. Chairman. I work for the Children's Rights Group, which is a children's advocacy organization within the 12 Western States. One of our primary goals has been to expand and improve the quality and participation of the federally financed nutrition programs for children. I am also the chairman of the National Community Action Agency Executive Directors Association, on the Nutrition Committee.

I come from the State of California, which, next to New York, has the second most eligible children for the summer food program. The proposals of the administration to alter this program and to reduce thereby the total cost will, in effect, have the direct effect of denying meals to needy children and in a manner that is far less subtle than the other proposed cuts. It simply says we know that a substantial number of children who absolutely qualify and are absolutely eligible for this program and who, in fact, we know come from impoverished families will be denied the benefits of this program.

In my honest judgment, the most coldblooded proposal included in this administration's plan is the reduction in participation in the summer food program.

I think by way of anticipating a question Senator McGovern and you have asked a number of other sponsors, I would like to first point out that there is not enough money in the summer food program to achieve the goal of a half million dollar reduction; therefore, the burden on me at this particular stage is not quite as substantial as it was for the other witnesses. However, anticipating that question, I began to think in terms of where do you reduce, where do you cut back in a program designed to meet the nutritional needs of American children, and being forced to make that decision is somewhat analogous to other kinds of very undesirable decisions. Although I am a lawyer by profession, my previous educational training is in the area of human physiology, and I have some background knowledge of nutrition and what the nutritional requirements are for human survival, and it would be like a question that would look at the absolutely essential diet for human survival, and with its various components, the essential acids, trace elements, carbohydrates, iron, protein, and asking a patient or to tell a person that he must make a decision as to what he is going to give up, and the decision is going to lead to, obviously, giving up one of those elements, and the answer has to be well, do you want to die of rickets, beriberi, or some other disease.

These programs have been determined by this body to be absolutely essential to the survival of a large number of American children whose health is of vital interest to us, and it is very difficult to answer the question that the Senator has put to each of the witnesses. I hope that we don't still feel compelled to ask that question, and I hope that you won't ask me because I can't answer it.

Senator DOLE. We don't have the answer either, but we have to do it. The Budget Committee says all right, out of this function you will cut so many dollars and you will spend so many dollars in that function, and there are also some other changes in the budget process that would almost make the Budget Committee—well, almost eliminate the need for any other committee—let's put it that way.

Now, did you make those same statements before they passed proposition 13 or has proposition 13 had a devastating effect on those programs?

Mr. POLK. Yes, it has. I am glad you raised that question. Proposition 13 has had a tremendous effect on those programs and the proposal of the administration to place severe limitation on private sponsors of some food programs will be even further devastating.

The result of proposition 13 was the immediate closure of public schools during the summer months in San Francisco and in the State of California. Like many other States, one-third of California public school children attended school prior to 1978 in the public schools during the summer, which is a substantial number. I found no other State with that high percentage of students. The result of those school closures was to eliminate sponsors that theretofore served approximately 60 percent of the children who participated in the summer school program. It, therefore, behooved advocates for the expansion of the program, as well as the State of California, to scramble to identify private nonprofit sponsors who had not been injured by the decrease in local tax funds available to fund their programs. The result was a large number of nonprofit organizations such as Community Action Agency and church groups sought to sponsor a program and have been doing so over the last 2 years now with some success, and will continue to do so this summer. However, if there is a limitation or a restriction imposed on their ability, it is simply by virtue of there being no private nonprofit organizations to contract with the private vendors to provide those meals and they will be unable to meet the needs of the children, just as the schools no longer do because they are now closed.

I believe a restriction imposed on the use of the private vendors by private nonprofit organizations would really be disastrous, particularly in California urban areas. In a way, the restriction is somewhat irrational, also. I am sure the Senator noted that no such restriction is put on public sponsors. So a local police department, for instance, could be the sponsor of the program, providing meals to 200,000 children in a city, and enter into a contract with, let's say, the Gummy Food Management Co. and provide those meals, where across the street a community action agency with commitment to serving the poor and the ability to provide those meals could not enter into the same contract, so rather than an effort to correct a problem which we all admitted existed in 1976, there seems to be an effort, essentially, to throw the baby out with the bath water, without really thinking about the solution to the problem.

Senator DOLE. Let me ask this question: I think it has already been addressed, in part. The administration proposal is that a State that loses its school lunch receive reimbursement from the State that did not administer the summer and child care program. I think you already expressed your views on that. I think the question is would the effect be any different if Congress just simply mandated that the States must run the programs in order to get reimbursed. That would be a little different, although the effect would be the same.

Mr. CIMAROSA. I think the effect would be the same. The issue would be the reason why the States gave the program back in the first place. Unless something is done to address that, we will find ourselves in the situation where the States will take over the program because they have to and do an absolutely lousy job in running it, and then the children will be on the streets. You can't force people to do something they can't do, especially when they look bad in the process.

In New York it is a question of how much will it take to run the program, and the reimbursement received in the past were not sufficient to run the program. This is a very difficult program to manage, no question about it.

Senator DOLE. Do you have the same view?

Mr. POLK. Yes, Senator. I think we need to look at some of the reasons the States have abandoned the program. However, I have some philosophical problem with holding the school lunch program hostage or for ransom in order to induce the States to administer the child care and summer food program. I think we have seen some rather bizarre things happen over the last few years and it would not shock me a whole lot for a few States to say well, in that event, we will no longer offer the school lunch program. I think sometimes those kind of inducements, or perhaps what might be called negative reenforcement, are effective, but you have to look at, perhaps, some of the things other than human services. Perhaps this might be recommending that revenue funds and highway funds be withheld from those States that withdraw the food programs for children.

Senator **Dole**. They tried that on the speed limit, I think.

Mr. **Polk**. And to a great extent it has worked.

Senator **Dole**. I appreciate very much your statement.

Do you have a written statement?

Mr. **Polk**. No, I do not. I did not know until Monday that I would testify. I will prepare a written statement and, hopefully, include some of my remarks.

Senator **Dole**. That will be made a part of the record.

Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF HON. CAROL TUCKER FOREMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I am pleased to be here today to discuss the 1981 budget for the Food and Nutrition Service and urge prompt passage of the Administration's proposed child nutrition legislation transmitted to Congress on March 10 and revised by our letter of April 4.

In light of spiraling inflation and increased unemployment, we have, over a period of months, reassessed the financial needs of our food assistance programs for 1981. These economic conditions are driving up the costs of the food programs. Food price inflation alone (projected to be 9-10 percent in 1981) accounts for over $1.3 billion in the FNS budget.

The Administration is determined to reduce the Federal budget deficit as part of the overall effort to control inflation. The Department's revised budget for food assistance proposed reductions in a number of programs, including food stamps, school lunch, summer feeding and special milk, which produce a savings totalling over $1.3 billion.

WIC

Recognizing that the WIC Program is quite cost effective, the 1981 January budget contains a substantial increase for the WIC Program. Several recent studies have demonstrated the value of this program. A study conducted at the Harvard School of Public Health in four WIC projects in Massachusetts found that the incidence of low-birth weight among infants whose mothers participated in the WIC Program during the prenatal period was markedly less than among infants whose mothers, although eligible, did not participate in the program. This reduction in incidence of low-birth weight led to lower hospitalization costs. The study estimated that each dollar spent in the prenatal components of the WIC Program resulted in a three dollar reduction in hospitalization costs, since the number of low-birth weight infants who had to be hospitalized was significantly reduced.

Meanwhile, a study conducted by the Waterbury, Connecticut Health Department in conjunction with Yale Medical School, found substantial reductions in infant mortality rates among WIC participants as opposed to persons in control groups.

Although there are demonstrated benefits of the WIC Program, many counties across the United States have no WIC Program. Where the program is available, some women and infants who could benefit from participation are not accepted due to funding limitations. The increase in the fiscal year 1981 budget for the WIC Program of $132 million will help meet those needs.

The Administration is proposing legislation to extend the WIC authorization through 1983. I should note that we are not now asking the Congress to increase the WIC authorization ceiling for fiscal year 1981. The revised budget requests $900 million for WIC in 1981, rather than the $946 million in the Administration's January budget. $900 million is the current authorization ceiling.

Proposals to make reductions in other child nutrition programs, which I will now detail, were formulated in conjunction with the President's decision to sign Public Law 95-627, and thereby expand the WIC Program.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PAID SCHOOL LUNCHES

Like last year, the Department is proposing to reduce by five cents the federal subsidy for students from families who are not eligible for free and reduced price meals. Those are families of 4 with an annual income of in excess of $15,800. However, there is one significant difference between this year's proposal and last year's. Currently paid lunches comprise 56 percent of all school lunches. Our new proposal will provide that if paid lunches fall to 50 percent or less of all school lunches in any school year, the five cent reduction would be rescinded.

Studies indicate that the five cent reduction would result in only about a four percent reduction in participation by paying students. The Congressional Budget

Office has arrived at a similar estimate and the GAO has noted that these estimates appear "to be based on reasonably conclusive analysis". However, our new proposal ensures that if the impact of the five-cent reduction would be substantially greater, then the reduction would be cancelled. We do not intend to jeopardize the operation of an effective lunch program.

Under current legislation, the five-cent reduction would affect families of four with incomes over $15,800 a year during the 1980–81 school year. (When combined with other proposals we are offering, families of four with incomes over $15,080 would be affected.)

The current level of support for all lunches under section 4 is 33.50 cents in cash and commodities. Under our proposal the subsidy for students from upper and middle income families would drop a few cents next year to 31.4 cents instead of increasing to 36.4 cents. There would be no decrease in the per meal commodity support. In fact, it should be pointed out that the Department is expected to increase its commodity support to the States. Under our policy of donating "bonus" commodities to States above and beyond the commodity support levels required by law, the Department expects to provide $80 million extra in commodities in 1981.

The result of our proposal would likely be an increase of about a nickel in the price charged to paying students. This means that middle and upper income families would have to pay about $9 more per year for lunches at school. This provision alone reduces federal expenditures by $158.2 million per year. Federal school meal support for these non-needy students would still continue to be over $750 million per year.

We believe that the small percentage of middle and upper income students who cease to purchase school lunch would generally either purchase food a la carte or bring a bag lunch from home. Studies conducted by the Congressional Budget Office indicate that the five cent reduction would not have any significant adverse impact on the nutritional status of these students.

REVISIONS IN ELIGIBILITY LIMITS FOR FREE AND REDUCED PRICE MEALS

This proposal is unchanged from last year. Currently, the eligibility limit for free meals is 125 percent of the poverty line, while the reduced-price eligibility limit is 195 percent of the poverty line. As of July 1, 1980, families of four will remain eligible for reduced-price school lunches at only 10 cents a lunch (and will receive a federal subsidy of over $1 per lunch) if their incomes are as high as $15,800 per year. Families of four will be eligible for free meals if their incomes fall below $10,000 per year.

Our proposal will set the reduced-price income level at 175 percent of the poverty line (where it stood until enactment of Public Law 94–105 in 1975) plus a standard deduction, and set the free meal income limit at 100 percent of the poverty line plus a standard deduction. The result is that the reduced price income limit will stand at about $15,000 instead of $15,800. The free meal income limit will stand at about $9,000 rather than $10,000. Families in the $9,000–-$10,000 income bracket will be eligible for only a slightly reduced benefit—a 10 cent lunch instead of a free one.

These modest adjustments provide a total savings of $196.6 million. Most of the savings come from lowering the free meal income limit. It is important to reiterate that all students losing eligibility for free meals will qualify for reduced price meals instead.

MEAL SUBSIDIES

School lunch, school breakfast and child care food program meal subsidies are currently adjusted semiannually to reflect changes in the consumer price index for all urban consumers. In keeping with the government wide effort to reduce inflation we are proposing that future adjustments to meal subsidies for these programs be made on an annual basis. An annual adjustment of the meal subsidies to these rates would be made each July 1 and would be applicable to the entire school year. An annual adjustment somewhat simplifies program administration by eliminating the mid-year change in rates provided to schools and institutions. The elimination of the January 1 rate adjustment will save an estimated $75 million in fiscal year 1981. It should be noted that the changes from semi-annual to annual adjustment are also being proposed by the administration for other programs, notably, federal employee retirement programs.

SUMMER FEEDING

We are also proposing legislation to strengthen the management of the summer food program. Of all FNS programs, the summer program has had the most trouble from waste and fraud by local operators. Over the past three years we have substantially tightened administrative controls at all levels which has also resulted in substantial reductions in annual program expenditures.

One measure of tighter administration is that program costs totalled over $140 million in the summer of 1976. The last budget of the Ford Administration anticipated summer feeding costs of $230 million by fiscal year 1978 and more in succeeding years. Despite major food price inflation, however, actual summer feeding costs dropped to $115 million in fiscal year 1979.

The recent semi-annual report to Congress of the Inspector General of USDA makes the same point regarding management improvement, expressing "cautious optimism that the most serious abuses of the program are declining."

Nevertheless, significant problems still remain. Audits conducted by the Inspector General show that a significant number of meals for which we are billed by private sponsors who have contracted with private vendors are excess or ineligible meals, and do not go to serve needy children. Therefore, we are proposing amendments aimed at strengthening management of the summer food program.

First, we are proposing to eliminate from participation in the summer program those large private sponsors which purchase meals from commerical food service management companies. Some of the problems consistently found by the Office of Inspector General center on private sponsors, generally in big cities, who contract with private vendors for the delivery of meals. Unfortunately, the errors and waste involving such sponsors run into substantial sums of money. The Department believes the elimination of these large agencies from program participation will significantly reduce this misuse of funds. All public sponsors, schools, and private sponsors who prepare their own meals could continue to participate in the program.

In addition, the proposal would permit small and medium size private sponsors who obtain means from food service management companies to continue to participate in the programs. Sponsors serving primarily migrant children, and those which serve a maximum of 1,500 children daily at not more than 15 sites would retain their eligibility. The problems of fraud and abuse endemic to larger private sponsors have not characterized operations of this size where tight management and control are more easily achieved. As a result, nearly 70 percent of the private sponsors who purchase meals from private vendors would be unaffected.

A second summer feeding change would limit the number of meals served per day to two—lunch, and either breakfast or a snack—except in camps and programs serving migrant children. The purpose of the summer food program is to continue the service provided by the school lunch and breakfast programs when school is out during summer months. There is not really a need for a third meal, when the schools generally provide no more than two meals during the school year. In addition, the Office of Inspector General has found the incidence of waste and abuse to be greater in those programs with multiple meal services.

Our summer feeding proposal requires States to conduct outreach in areas with high concentration of low income families. This should result in increase availability of services in those areas where needy children are concentrated.

This legislation also provides additional state administrative expense funds to assist states in the operation of the Summer Food Service Program. These new funds include a base grant of $30,000, separate funding for the conduct of audits, and additional funds provided by the Secretary on a case by case basis to large State agencies when the need for such funds is fully justified.

Our legislative proposals for summer feeding would save about $45 million.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Last year, the Department proposed to end the special milk program in schools that participate in the school lunch or breakfast program. Such a proposal would save over $140 million in fiscal year 1981. This year's proposal is different. It is a scaled-down proposal to modify the special milk subsidy levels. Our new proposal would not eliminate the milk program from a single school, and would achieve a more modest savings of $55 million.

The proposal would set the special milk subsidy at five cents per half-pint in schools that also offer milk as part of the school lunch or breakfast programs. This five-cent subsidy would apply only to children who are not poor. Needy children would continue to be eligible for free milk, and schools would continue to be subsidized at higher rates for free milk.

Currently the subsidy for milk served to non-poor children is 7.75 cents per half-pint, and due to an automatic indexing provision of current law, it is expected to rise to 8.50 cents for the next school year. By reducing this subsidy to 5 cents, our proposal will simply require those children who do not buy the school lunch to pay a few pennies for more milk.

The minimal impact on the dairy industry of this proposal should be more than offset by the growth in the WIC Program. As noted earlier, the 1981 budget calls for a substantial increase in WIC funding over 1980 levels. Over one half of the WIC foods are directly related to the dairy industry (i.e., milk and cheese).

In arriving at these decisions, careful consideration was given to both health and economic impacts upon families involved. There is little question in our minds that the health and nutritional impacts of reaching more women and children in the WIC Program are far in excess of those achieved by subsidizing middle and upper income school lunches at 36 cents per lunch rather than at the 31 cents per lunch we are proposing, by subsidizing milk purchased by non-needy students at 8½ cents rather than 5 cents per half-pint, and by keeping the eligibility limits for free- and reduced-price meals at current levels that approach $16,000 a year.

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE FUNDS

We are proposing to extend the provision of State Administrative Expense funds for three years, thus continuing to provide State agencies with administrative funds. Also we are proposing to give the Secretary authority to impose a sanction against a State which fails to properly administer the School and Child Care Programs. In view of the recent findings of the Office of Inspector General and the General Accounting Office, such sanction authority may prove necessary to assure that State agencies take needed corrective action when they are found in non-compliance with program requirement. This provision for sanction authority was included in the Agriculture Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1980, but we believe it should also be embodied in authorizing legislation. A similar provision was passed by this Committee last year as part of H.R. 4136.

DIRECT FEDERAL OPERATION OF PROGRAM

Throughout the nation, direct Federal operation of programs within a State is extremely rare. Most States complain that Federal control usurps State's rights. However, in the case of child nutrition, the number of programs administered directly by the Secretary has increased steadily over the past several years.

As of May 1, 1980, the number of States in which the Secretary will directly administer Child Nutrition Programs is outlined below:

	States
National School Lunch, School Breakfast and Special Milk Programs in private schools	13
National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast and Special Milk Programs in public residential child care institutions	7
National School Lunch, School Breakfast and Special Milk Programs in private residential child care institutions	13
Nutrition Education and Training Program in private schools	4
Summer Food Service Program	21
Child Care Food Program	14

We are proposing that the Secretary no longer administer the Summer Food Service or Child Care Food Program in any States. We would continue to have the authority to operate the school food, special milk, and NET Program in private schools and residential child care institutions.

There are a number of reasons why this change is necessary. As we have increased the management requirements for the summer program in an effort to improve services and reduce program abuses, more and more States have turned the summer program back to the Secretary. Last year, California notified us in March that it was turning the summer program back to the Department, and we undertook the massive job of implementing the second largest summer program in the country on 3 months notice.

It is impossible to maintain program quality, accountability, and controlled expansion when programs are administered not by the States where the children live and the sponsoring organizations are located, but by Federal regional offices, often distant from the States involved. The Federal staff available to conduct direct program operation is not large enough and furthermore we do not believe that direct Federal administration is an appropriate Federal role. We believe that the same State staff who administer the program during the 9 month school year can administer the program during the summer. From the standpoint of efficient management it makes little sense to allow State staff workloads to decrease during the summer while additional Federal staff are brought in to run the Summer Food Program.

Inspector General Thomas McBride recently testified before the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee that "the provision currently allowing any State to drop the program in favor of direct Federal administration has had two effects. First, (Federal) agency personnel who could be reviewing all State operations, monitoring and providing technical assistance are instead assigned to run the program. Second, on more than one occasion the threat to drop out of the program has been used as a powerful weapon to resist taking effective corrective action on deficiencies. It is imperative that direct program administration be recognized as a State responsibility."

We are therefore proposing that in order to receive National School Lunch funds under sections 4 and 11 of the National School Lunch Act, States shall assume administration of the Summer Food Service and Child Care Food Programs. The legislation emphasizes that the programs need not be administered by the State education agency, but that States should choose the proper focus of responsibility for these two programs within the overall context of the State's health, education, social, and recreational services to children. After October 1, 1981, the Secretary would not be authorized to operate the summer food service program or child care food program. States with biennial legislative sessions would receive an extension for one year.

Other provisions in our proposed legislation will facilitate State efforts to operate these programs. Our proposal to eliminate from the summer program those private sponsors that purchase meals from food service management companies will streamline the administration of the program, and make it easier for States to run. Our proposals to increase State administrative expenses for the Summer Food Program will provide more resources for program management. Moreover, with the increased emphasis on public sponsorship of summer food programs, it is essential that States use their existing networks of child nutrition program cooperators to expand the participation of public sponsors, such as schools, in the program.

The Child Care Food Program would also be strengthened by State administration. The majority of States already establish standards for licensing child care centers, and State administration of the Child Care Food Program would result in greater uniformity and consistency in child care services within a State. In addition, several months ago we increased the portion of State administrative expense funds allocated to administer Child Care Food Programs.

Direct operation of the Child Care and Summer Programs is a burden we can no longer sustain. Federal employment ceilings have continued to decline while program funds and State administrative funds have steadily increased. The responsibility for delivering basic nutrition services to children must be returned to the States, where it belongs.

PAPERWORK REDUCTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SIMPLIFICATIONS

The Department is seeking methods to reduce the administrative burden on State agencies while assuring accountable management of all food programs. Several provisions in this legislative proposal help achieve this goal.

First, we recommend that all State Administrative Expense Funds be available to States for use as needed in meeting the cost of administration of the School Lunch and the other Child Nutrition Programs. Currently, the law requires States to use a specific amount of administrative funds for the school food programs, another specific amount for the summer food programs, and another amount for the child care food programs. States are given only limited ability to move administrative funds from one program area to another. The result is that States cannot target their resources where they are most needed, and may have unused funds in one area, while having insufficient resources in another. In addition, there is a significant paperwork burden in accounting for the allocation of resources among each of the child nutrition programs. Our proposal would provide administrative funds to States in a lump sum and permit the States to allocate resources where the need is greatest. States would no longer be required to direct interchangeable staff talent solely to a specific program. This will reduce paperwork while allowing States the flexibility to develop staff resources for several programs and when necessary, retarget those resources to problem areas without the fear of being unable to account for fund usage in a given program. This is consistent with our goal to improve the quality and integrity of State program administration, and is identical to a provision approved by the Committee last year as part of H.R. 4136.

Another reduction in paperwork would be accomplished through our proposed elimination of the statutory requirement that State plans for use of staff administrative expense funds include staffing patterns for personnel below the State level. With over 95,000 schools participarting in the School Programs, this single change will result in a substantial reduction in burden.

Paperwork can also be simplified by eliminating the need for schools to account separately for the cost of the School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs. If the costs of both programs can be accounted for and paid in one process, rather than allocating costs among each program and documenting those costs separately for each program, administrative burdens can be eased. A provision of Public Law 95-627 designed to accomplish this goal was inadvertently drafted in a fashion that has precluded its suggested implementation. Our proposal would redraft this provision to accomplish its original intent.

Finally, the use of a standard deduction, in determining family income, rather than the current, more cumbersome itemized deductions, will reduce the time and work involved in certifying children for free and reduced price meals. Presently, four separate, itemized deductions are in use.

CONTINUATION OF THE NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM AND FOOD SERVICE EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE RESERVE

The Department is proposing that the Nutrition Education and Training Program (NET) be extended for three years. We believe that NET can provide children with better learning opportunities regarding food and nutrition. We are currently conducting a multi-year evaulation of the program to determine its strengths and weaknesses, and how it can be made more effective. We believe the authorization ought to be extended.

The Department is also recommending that the reserve clause of the Food Service Equipment provisions of the Child Nutrition Act be extended for three years. There are still schools throughout the nation that need funding to help initiate school lunch and breakfast programs. The assistance provided through the reserve clause of the Food Service Equipment provisions can assist these schools in starting these feeding programs.

APPENDIX, USDA-FNS—REGIONAL OFFICE ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS

Private schools [1]	Residential child care institutions [1]		Summer programs	Child care food program	Nutrition education and training
	Public	Private			
Alabama	Missouri	Alabama	Alaska	Arkansas	Colorado
Arkansas	Nebraska	Arkansas	Arkansas	Colorado	Georgia
Colorado	North Dakota	Georgia	California	Georgia	North Dakota
Delaware	Oregon	Hawaii	Georgia	Hawaii	South Dakota
Hawaii	South Carolina	Maine	Hawaii	Missouri	
Maine	Texas	Missouri	Iowa	Nebraska	
Nebraska	Washington	Nebraska	Kansas	New Mexico	
North Dakota		North Dakota	Michigan	New York	
South Dakota		South Carolina	Minnesota	North Dakota	
Tennessee		Tennessee	Missouri	Oregon	
Texas		Texas	Nebraska	South Carolina	
Virginia		Virginia	New Mexico	Tennessee	
Washington		Washington	New York	Virginia	
			North Dakota	Washington	
			Oregon		
			South Carolina		
			Tennessee		
			Trust Territory		
			Virginia		
			Washington		
			Wyoming		

[1] Includes school lunch, school breakfast, and special milk programs.

Statement of Dorothy L. Callahan, R.D., State Coordinator, Nutrition Education and Training Program, National NET Liaison Officer, Massachusetts Department of Education, Bureau of Nutrition Education and School Food Services, Boston, Mass.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: My name is Mrs. Dorothy Callahan. I am the State Coordinator for the Nutrition Education and Training Program in Massachusetts and the National Liaison Officer for State Coordinators of this Program throughout the country. I am in Washington, today, speaking on behalf of all State Coordinators to request your continued support of the Nutrition Education and Training Program under Section 19 of Public Law 95-166. We sincerely urge that this legislation be reauthorized, without change, for at least another three years. This would extend funding through fiscal year 1983.

I have a personal interest in this legislation. I was a member of the original task force assembled by you, Mr. Chairman, to make recommendations for a law authorizing nutrition education in our schools. As a registered dietitian and a certified teacher of health education, I am aware of the critical need to improve the nutritional well-being of children. As a nutrition education specialist with the State Department of Education for ten years and a food service director of a multiple school system for fifteen years, I know that the Child Nutrition Programs represent an ideal vehicle for improving the eating habits of our students.

I could tell you of many exciting nutrition education activities occurring in classrooms throughout the nation—learning experiences with positive results. However, I have been told that the Committee believes that nutrition education in the classroom has been well documented and that it is interested in how the Nutrition Education and Training Program is affecting food service programs. Therefore, I will address my remarks to this aspect of the law and will try to convey the sentiments of the many State Coordinators, local coordinators and project directors, federal agents, and other interested people and groups who provided me with slides and suggestions for my testimony today. (A bibliography of their names is attached.) In our conversations and communications, we agreed that the Nutrition Education and Training Program impacts on Child Nutrition Programs in at least five major ways.

TRAINING CAFETERIA PERSONNEL

The law requires that food service personnel be instructed "in the principles and practices of food service management." I do not know of a single participating state who has not implemented this training. For some states, such as Connecticut and Rhode Island, Section 19 funding provided the first real in-depth opportunity for reaching personnel; for other states, such as Massachusetts, training efforts could be expanded.

Methods of training have been varied and innovative. North Dakota has implemented a correspondence course; Indiana is promoting "Grass Roots," a slide/tape self-instructional package; Louisiana and New Hampshire are teaching food service managers to be the "trainers" back in their communities. Ohio has established Nutrition Education Centers at twelve state universities, each staffed with a coordinator who must conduct twenty workshops within a specific region. Massachusetts has teams providing on-site training in schools and also is operating a central training kitchen. New Hampshire is cooperating with a kitchen and classroom on wheels which travels throughout the state. Many states are developing manuals, films, and video tapes which can be duplicated and shared.

IMPROVING SELF-ESTEEM/IMAGE

All of the State Coordinators asked me to stress that an essential objective of their nutrition education and training is to raise the self-esteem and image of school food service personnel. Food service staff must recognize their contribution to the educational program and to participate as members of the educational team. Coordinators are promoting this goal through meetings, training materials, and informative newsletters distributed on a regular basis.

Professionalism is being promoted by cooperating with the American School Food Service Association Certification and the American Dietetic Association Continuing Education Hour Programs. Some workshops and courses provide undergraduate or graduate credit. Rhode Island conducts an incentive training program, with a salary increment awarded when three credits have been earned.

Self-image is also increased through a team approach at workshops. This fosters understanding between teachers and food service personnel as well as coordinating cafeteria and classroom efforts. California, Oregon, Hawaii, Nebraska, Louisiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, Ohio, West Virginia, New York, Maine—in fact, all participating states indicated team teaching was a high priority with positive results. One workshop leader in Massachusetts commented, "This seems to be the first time that teachers and school food service workers in this community have communicated!"

Raising the status of Child Nutrition Programs is being implemented with students through active Youth Advisory Councils; with parents, through newsletters, workshops, advisory councils, PTA nights, family days at school, and volunteers in the cafeteria; and with the community, through TV shows and public service announcements, radio talk shows, and newspaper articles. I wish that I could share with you the myriad of pictures and newspaper clipping that have been mailed to me during the past week.

IMPROVE CAFETERIA ENVIRONMENT

Many of the projects supported by Section 19 money are helping to make the cafeteria a more pleasant place in which to eat. In Oklahoma, the students were allowed to redecorate the cafeteria. Perhaps the color scheme did not please adults, but it suited the kids. In Lauderdale County, Mississippi, the school painted murals and made hanging mobiles to improve the cafeteria atmosphere; in Rutherford and Chattanooga Counties, Tennessee, students developed posters on nutrition and the food service program to decorate the cafeterias; in Oklahoma, parents made nutrition posters to decorate the school cooridors as well as the cafeteria. In Oregon, students work with the food service staff to personalize the cafeteria. A new name has been adopted, The Pirate's Plank, and Paulette's Buns (a school-baked whole wheat hamburger roll) has become a menu favorite.

The Massachusetts' survey of 80,000 public school children listed the many complaints concerning cafeteria environment—too long to wait, no time to eat, no place to sit, too much noise and confusion. Section 19 monies are being used to alleviate some of these problems.

Provincetown, Massachusetts, for example, has instituted family-style feeding. The principal and teachers eat with the children; parents volunteer their services during lunch. The children set the tables, serve the food, and perform clean-up duties. A quiet reading or drawing time follows the meal service. A parent wrote to me, "The family-style lunch has been an education for me! Children can do their share, clean up after themselves willingly, and help each other when problems arise. It is a delight to experience. Thank you for helping to make it possible! My hope is that many programs of this nature will be possible in the future."

A change to family-style feeding by a Trotwood-Madison District school in Ohio not only improved the cafeteria environment but also resulted in a 50 percent decrease in plate waste. This same school rescheduled recess to before lunch and believes that the children eat better, with no drowsiness in the afternoon. At the Loring School, Sudbury, Massachusetts, the principal reports that the "recess before lunch experiment" has the children eating more and better lunches now that they are not rushing out to the playground. Also, food waste has all but disappeared as a result of the innovation. Other schools in Massachusetts agree that when playtime is before lunch more children participate, there is less plate waste, and fewer children appear in the health room with stomach upsets.

IMPROVED MENU QUALITY

Improving menu quality to increase participation and decrease plate waste is another priority of projects funded under Section 19. You are aware, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress and other groups throughout the country have expressed great concern in these areas, too.

Federal, state, and local surveys demonstrate that vegetable acceptance is a major problem. Massachusetts studies show that almost 50 percent of the students eat less than the recommended servings of fruits and vegetables needed to supply the essential nutrients and that much of the vegetable served on the lunch is returned to the dishroom window.

For these reasons, Massachusetts made increased vegetable/fruit consumption a priority for Fiscal Year 1980 monies. Sixteen mini grants addressing these issues will be awarded. Resource materials relating to this priority, including cafeteria and classroom training films, are available at six regional centers for loan to local educational agencies.

Following the lead of fast food restaurants, the promotion of salad bars in school cafeterias has become a national effort. They are not limited to just the older students. West Virginia has a salad bar in a child care center; the Norwell Public Schools in Massachusetts reaches all children in grades one through twelve. The food service director in Norwell reports a 15 percent increase in participation since installing salad bars. Eighty percent of the children choose salad over hot vegetables for the school lunch—and the garbage pail is nearly empty. His plans for building and operating low cost salad bars are being disseminated throughout Massachusetts.

Other efforts to improve menu quality include training of personnel in preparation, serving, and merchandising. Schools are encouraged to serve more fresh fruits and to display them prominently on the counter. Two satellite schools in Flint, Michigan changed from prepackaged meals to bulk service and report that children are eating better and are cutting down on waste.

PROMOTING A LEARNING LABORATORY

Public Law 95-166 states that the school food service program shall be used as a learning laboratory and State Coordinators are making every effort to make this happen. A principal in West Virginia says that the nutrition project has been the best vehicle for establishing rapport and correlation between the classroom and cafeteria.

A manager in Shreveport, Louisiana, has developed her own puppet show for lower elementary grades; a math class in Oklahoma made a study of milk consumption in the cafeteria to reduce waste; students in Medford, Oregon, wrote the grant proposal that includes working with the head cook on menu review, taste testing, and the operation of a non-cooked, no-cleanup breakfast program.

Fifth grade students in Natick, Massachusetts developed, conducted, and analyzed a lunch survey; children in New York participated in a Food, Fitness, and Fun program—a weight control program that included lowered calorie lunches served in the cafeteria. Students in Hawaii conducted a one-week campaign to decrease plate waste. They studied the amount of money lost, made posters, published newsletters, made announcements on the school intercom—and decreased plate waste by 42 percent.

The school nurse in Gulfport, Mississippi set up a nutrition booth in the cafeteria were children can ask questions and pick up nutrition messages as they go through the line. Students in Rutherford County, Tennessee are taken to the local supermarket by the school lunch manager and teacher; in Chattanooga County, they visit the school kitchen for baking demonstrations.

Students in New York participated in international foods: A Culinary View of the Olympics—studying about each country in the classroom followed by a typical dinner in the cafeteria. Ethnic days in Provincetown, Massachusetts allowed school children the opportunity to help cook in the kitchen. Louisiana elementary school children, with the help of teachers and parents, are planting a one-half-acre garden. The harvest will be used in the school lunch. Similar projects will occur in Massachusetts using existing school greenhouses.

NEEDS TO CONTINUE PROGRAM

Does nutrition education make a difference? A 1978-79 California evaluation showed that project participants had a level of understanding of good nutrition which was 21 percent higher than nonparticipants. Their attitudes toward good nutrition improved by 11 percent; their food choices, by 15 percent. Overall plate waste decreased by 26 percent. Similar results were reported from 1974-75 nutrition education projects in Nebraska and West Virginia.

Although this program has been in effect less than two years, it has received the national recognition and endorsement of the council of chief State School Officers. In a position paper prepared this year, the Council is urging the continuation of the program, saying: "Despite its modest level and scant history, the program has already begun to show that nutrition education may well make a substantial difference in how children think about their eating habits * * * Child nutrition programs of all sorts are preventive—that is, they help children learn and practice the good eating habits necessary to lifetime good health. In the school lunch program, children begin to learn important good nutrition by practice; appropriate nutrition education can help children generalize these good habits to their own individual lives.

Therefore, on behalf of all State Coordinators and other interested individuals and groups who have talked or written to me during the past week, I ask that you, Mr. Chairman, and the Committee consider the following requests:

1. *The reauthorization of Section 19 under Public Law 95-166, as originally enacted.*—The flexibility of this law is desirable since each State has its own nutrition needs and priorities. As we grow, successful programs will be disseminated and replicated. For example, Massachusetts is utilizing materials developed by New Hampshire; Boston is participating in the Nebraska Project which has a strong cafeteria component.

2. *Adequate funding of this legislation.*—This is a difficult request in view of plans for a balanced budget, but it is essential if we are to realize full value from the money already expended.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for being allowed to give testimony to this Committee. I would like to stress the dedication of the Nutrition Education and Training Coordinators and their many hours of hard work. We ask that the Nutrition Education and Training Program have time to prove its effectiveness.

APPENDIX A

AN EXPLANATION OF THE CASH FLOW OF NET FUNDS THROUGH A STATE

When the 95th Congress enacted the law, States were promised three years of funding to demonstrate that nutrition education and training could help to improve the eating habits of our youth. Chronologically, it would appear that the Program has been in effect for three years; in reality, there has been hardly more than one harried year of actual program implementation.

President Carter did not sign the legislation until November 1977—the second month of fiscal year 1978 guaranteed funding; guidelines for writing State Plans were not received until June, 1978—the ninth month of fiscal year 1978 guaranteed monies were not approved until September 1978—the twelfth and last month of fiscal year 1978. One year of guaranteed program funding had passed with only the federal government's approval to begin.

However, even with approval, most States could not implement programs immediately. Reaching the local populations in the manner designated by the law, and with fair competition, can be a six-month's procedure. In Massachusetts, for example, discretionary grants announced through Requests for Proposals in October of 1978 could not be awarded until April 1, 1979, and full evaluation of these projects cannot be made until after June of 1980.

Similar conditions exist in other States. In my conversations with Coordinators, they requested that I emphasize these issues to you. Most States could not approve programs with fiscal year 1978 funds before March of 1979, and many of these programs are not due to be completed until September of 1980. With the interruptions of summer vacations, actual teaching time using 1978 funding has been only one year or less. This time lag is repeated with fiscal years 1979 and 1980 monies. Most of the grants and contracts awarded this year will not be completed until at least September of 1981; therefore, the full evaluation of three years of Nutrition Education and Training funding cannot be made until after that time.

This time lag also affected the expenditure of Section 19 monies. The recommended fiscal year 1981 funding of 15 million dollars represents a decrease of more than 40 percent from the original level. The reason being given for a budget cut is that States have not spent the money which was appropriated. It seems that of the 52 million dollars appropriated, only 26 million has been drawn down. It is important to realize here that the appropriated money is obligated but cannot be drawn down until work is completed.

These explanatory remarks are made to help you make a fair assessment of the Nutrition Education and Training Program under Public Law 95-166 through March 1980. They are not meant to denigrate the program or to infer that little is happening at the local level. From my testimony, which only touches the surface, you can see that many exciting and worthwhile activities are occuring in school feeding programs.

APPENDIX B—BIBLIOGRAPHY

Individuals and agencies submitting slides, training data, and other information concerning the involvement of the Nutrition Education and Training Program with the Child Nutrition Program. (Other people are also providing help but will be too late to be included on this list.)

Regional NET liaison officers

Mid-Atlantic: Anita Ellis, State Coordinator, West Virginia.
Mid-West: Mary Jo Tuckwell, State Coordinator, Wisconsin.
Mountain Plains: Eleanor Hunsley, State Coordinator, Iowa.
New England: Louis Selnau, State Coordinator, Connecticut.
Southeast: Linda Schmidt, State Coordinator, South Carolina.
Southwest: Carolyn Trivette, State Coordinator, Louisiana.
Western: Amanda Dew Mellinger, State Coordinator, California.

U.S. Department of Agriculture

Directors, nutrition and technical services

Mid-Atlantic: Dr. Bernard Brackfeld.
Mid-West: Dr. Robert Dean.
Mountain Plains: Ms. Esther Eicher.
New England: Ms. Marie Lubeley.
Southeast: Ms. Polly Miller.
Southwest: Ms. Emma Nance.
Western: Ms. Josephine Blue.

Regional NET coordinators

Mid-West: Dr. Lucille Stiles.
New England: Ms. Noreen Waters.
Southeast: Ms. Lanna Busman.
Western: Ms. Mavis Buchholz.

Other U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel, New England

Catherine Jensen, Director, Information Services.

Patricia Berkowitz, Information Services.

California: Violet Roefs, NETP Education Consultant.

Connecticut: Janina Czajkowski, principal investigator for NET; Vera Perrini, School Food Service, Newton; Ruth Remick, NET food service management consultant.

Ashford Public Schools.
Bristo Public Schools.
Newtown Public Schools.
Orange Public Schools.
University of Connecticut.

Idaho: Rebecca Swartz, NET State coordinator.

Illinois: Tina Johnston, NET State coordinator; Emmerine Clarkstone, principal; Beth O'Laughlin, NET consultant; Lois Ward, teacher—Medgar Evers Elementary School.

Indiana: Iris Violet (Vi) Echelberger, NET State coordinator; Marilyn Schuchart, Food Service Management consultant.

Iowa: Janice Dudley, director of Food Service—Des Moines Public Schools.

Louisiana: Archdiocese Schools; Caddo Parish Schools; Caldwell Parish Schools; Livingston Parish Schools; Louisiana Tech University; New Orleans Public Schools; St. Joseph's Academy, Baton Rouge Diocese Schools; Union Parish Schools.

Maine: Suzanne Bazinet, NET State coordinator; Eastern Maine Vocational Technical Institute; Kennebec Valley Vocational Technical Institute; University of Maine, Farmington; University of Maine, Orono; Washington Valley Vocational Technical Institute.

Massachusetts State Department of Education, Bureau of Nutrition Education and School Food Services: John C. Stalker, executive director; Thomas P. O'Hearn, director.

Nutrition education specialists
Monya H. Geller
Adele A. Avitabile
Sydney Flum
Pauline Friedrichs
Patricia Malloy
Diane O'Neil
M. Yvonne Pettiford
Elizabeth-Anne Rogers
Marguerite Savage

Operational specialists
Louise E. Watts
Frances Cullen
Elizabeth Waldron
Marjorie Cowles
Marie Eberle
Martha Herlihy
Sandra Holmes
Mary Lou Moran
Donna Psiaki
Susan Santangelo

Local education and grant personnel, school food service directors

Nancy Brown
Ruth Bohannon
John Callahan
Gloria Carritte
Gloria Casale
Margaret Cleary
John Crafton
Nancy Dearborn
Sister Frances Eichhorn
Margaret Farley
Lyn Fleming
Maura Hennigan
Edgar Johnson
Polly Kornblith
Joan Koziol
Virginia Maxfield
Mary McCrensky
Mary McLaughlin
Florrie Paige
Linda Piette
Helaine Rockett
Patricia Sennott
Photine Skandalis
Duncan Stewart
Lou Tardi
Kathleen Zalucki

Local educational and other agencies

Boston Public Schools
Brookline Public Schools
Dover/Sherborn Public Schools
Dracut Public Schools
Forward Services, Inc.
Nutrition Education and Food Management Institute
Oakham Public Schools
Peabody Public Schools
Provincetown Public Schools
Rockland Public Schools

Hampshire Educational Collaborative
Laboure Junior College
Natick Public Schools
New Salem/Wendell Schools
Norwell Public Schools
Southwick Public Schools
Sudbury Public Schools
University of Massachusetts
Wakefield Public Schools

Michigan: Flint Public Schools.

Minnesota: Barbara Kalina, NET State coordinator.

Mississippi: Gulfport Public Schools; Lauderdale County Schools.

Nebraska: Glenda Uhrmacher, NET State coordinator.

New Hampshire: Grete Rule, NET State coordinator; Hannelore Dawson, Nutrition at Work; Sylvia Marple, Nutrition at Work; Patricia McHale, Nutrition at Work—Fitzwilliam Schools, Stratham Schools, University of New Hampshire.

New York: Agnes Teske, NET State coordinator; Lea Bancroft, regional NET coordinator; Barbara Callahan, regional NET coordinator; Annette Hibler, regional NET coordinator.

North Dakota: Loris Freier, NET State coordinator.

Ohio: Harold Armstrong, NET State coordinator; Janice Greider, AV supervisor, Newark City School District; Jean Hasse, NET coordinator; Jean Jones, NETP, State Department of Education; David Root, State Department of Education; Reva Swan, Food Service Director, Newark City School District.

University NET coordinators

Linda Collins
Doris Cambruzzi
Sharon Fischer
Carol Giesecke
Frances Lowe
Dr. Grace Napier
Mary Overmeyer
Pamela Price

Local project and school food service directors

Helen Burke
Donna Phillips
Catherine Greider
Denise Shockley
Wilma Wood

Local educational and other agencies

Canal Winchester School
Cherry Valley Elementary School
Corpus Christie School
Gallia County Schools
Newark City Schools
Northmount Schools
Piketon County Schools
Ravenna Day Nursery
Trotwood-Madison School District

State universities

Central State
Cleveland State
Kent State
Ohio State
University of Akron
University of Cincinnati
University of Toledo
Youngstown University
Wright University

Oklahoma: Mary Jo Stewart, NET State coordinator; Central State University; Broken Arrow Schools; Deer Creek Elementary Schools; Prague Schools.

Oregon: Len Tritsch, NET State coordinator.

Local educational personnel—John Campbell, Irene Marshall, Cecil Miller, Edward Murray.

Local educational agencies—David Douglas, District; North Clackamas, District; Phoenix, Talent District.

Rhode Island: Lindell Northup, NET State coordinator.

Tennessee: Chattanooga County Schools, Rutherford County Schools.

Texas: Carolyn Klein, NET State coordinator.

West Virginia: Parkersburg School, Martinsburg School.

STATEMENT OF GLENN A. EVERLY, DIRECTOR OF INSTRUCTION, TAYLOR COUNTY SCHOOLS, GRAFTON, W. VA.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: My name is Glenn Everly, and I am the Director of Instructional Programs for the Taylor County Board of Education in Grafton, West Virginia. I am in Washington today to speak as a school administrator, to request your continued support of the Nutrition Education and Training Program under Section 19 of Public Law 95-166.

As you consider this legislation, I would ask that you consider what has happened in many West Virginia Schools to date. After being contacted last Thursday to appear before this committee, I began immediately contacting local principals as well as other elementary and secondary principals from across the State of West Virginia who have been involved in the Nutrition Education Program. Specifically, I asked them if the NET program had made a difference in their school programs.

At this time I would like to share their responses with you. Mr. Dan Mankins, principal of the Anna Jarvis Elementary School in Taylor County, stated that eighty-five per cent of his total staff, including specialists such as music, art, and physical education teachers, received the nutrition training and each of these individuals is now involved in an on-going nutrition education program. Parents have been invited to participate in the program. A group of five parents are invited to meet each month with the head cook, several teachers and students to devise menus. Completed menus are sent home with each of the schools, 798 students to share with all parents. Special menus are encouraged from individual classrooms and each grade level submits a menu each month.

Additionally, all non-food value items have been eliminated from snack sales. Food items solicited from parents for classroom parties will be changed in the 1980–81 school term. Traditionally holiday parties have included the serving of cupcakes and kool-aid to each student. Again, with the participation of a parent group, a nutritious snack foods list has been compiled and will be distributed to parents donating party foods next school year.

Cooks were also included in the nutrition training program and this has resulted in added changes in the school lunch program. Less salts, sugars and starches are now found in the school menu. Cooks have been invited into classrooms to assist with nutrition activities and they have invited classes to visit the kitchen.

Participation in the school food service program is up and plate waste is down. During March, 1980, ninety-one percent of the students ate lunch at school and 55 percent had breakfast. Statistical data has not been completed relative to plate waste, but the school cafeteria personnel indicate that it has been greatly reduced.

Dennis Cromwell, principal of the Flemington Elementary School in Taylor County, reports that subsequent to the completion of the nutrition training program at his school he has observed an increased frequency of classroom activities relating to nutrition. The materials provided by the state department were enthusiastically received by students and staff. Children are now willing to try new or differenct foods. Parents have indicated that they notice improvements in their children's awareness (in the home) of food groups as they relate to meal balancing. Finally, school food service personnel are of the opinion that there really is less food being wasted.

Winona Hall and Robert Harris, principals of elementary schools in Wood County, related that the nutrition education program is now a total school and community approach. Food service personnel and parents visit the classroom to assist with nutrition instruction and menu planning. Teachers encourage students to eat at school. Parents, grandparents and school board members have been invited to visit the school and share a school lunch. The school children developed a "Good Nutrition" exhibit and displayed it at a local shopping mall. Some parents report that they are now allowing their children to help with food selections and menu planning at home.

Until now I have related the effects of the NET program in Elementary Schools. In discussing the program with Mr. Ronald D. Woltring, principal of the Rowlesburg High School in Preston County, I found him to be equally as enthusiastic about the program. Two members of his staff attended a NET class conducted at West Virginia University during the Summer of 1979. Upon the completion of the training program, they returned to the school and started working with the athletic staff to include good nutrition as a part of the football program. The community agreed to provide donated foods for the fall football practice sessions. Athletes were instilled with the idea of a need for a balanced diet. School food service personnel donated their time and were assisted by players and coaches in menu planning. Nutritious foods were substituted for soda pop and candy during morning and afternoon breaks.

At the beginning of the school term, monies were obtained from county and school funds to purchase nutrition education instructional materials for inclusion in the school curriculum. Changes similar to those related by the elementary principals were also expressed by Mr. Woltring. Student involvement in menu planning has taken place. An increased awareness of the need for a balanced diet is evident, and participation in the school lunch program is up.

In summary, it is clearly evident that the NET Program has achieved success in the school cafeterias and instructional programs which it has touched in West

Virginia. I can personally attest that the NET program has allowed nutrition education to assume its rightful place among the instructional programs of Taylor County. However, let us take a look at where we still must go.

The West Virginia State Department staff has trained thirty-three cadre members throughout the state made up of elementary teachers and principals. To date, they have conducted training programs in thirty of the state's fifty-five counties. Approximately 1,300 or about ten percent of all teachers have participated in the training program. If we are to introduce a nutrition education curriculum statewide, funding must continue.

There are sixty-four child care sponsors in West Virginia. Better than one-half of these programs have been reached by training programs. If we are to continue this practice, funding must continue.

The state department staff is sponsoring seminars at West Virginia University and Marshall University during the summer of 1980. Two athletic coaches from each county will be invited to participate in a program entitled "Nutrition and the Athlete". This is an extremely important and timely program in that West Virginia had two high school athletes who died during the summer of 1979 as a result of dehydration. If programs like this are to continue, funding must continue.

I feel that I have summarized an outstanding beginning for an improved nutrition program for the boys and girls of West Virginia. However, a great deal remains to be done and we do need your support.

STATEMENT OF ANN C. GRANDJEAN, M.S., R.D., ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, SWANSON CENTER FOR NUTRITION, INC., OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I am Ann Grandjean, Associate Director of the Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. in Omaha, Nebraska. I am in charge of nutrition education programs for the Center and in that capacity have worked closely with the NET Program. I represented the Society for Nutrition Education as a member of the planning committee for the National NETP Coordinators meeting held in San Francisco, July, 1979. I am a member of the Nutrition Section, Sports Medicine Council, U.S. Olympic Committee; the relevance of which I will discuss later.

I want to thank the members of the Subcommittee on Nutrition for your past support of the NET Program and for your interest and concern for the future and health of this nation's children. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify before you regarding a program that can have a tremendous impact on the health of America's children and on nutritional services to all school children.

The Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc., established in 1973, was patterned after the guidelines for regional nutrition centers set forth during the White House Conference on Nutrition in 1969. The Center is a non-profit, tax exempt, private operating foundation. Soon after the Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. was established, the staff developed a master plan for nutrition education activities. This plan encompassed nutrition education from preschool years through graduate and professional schools.

Staff of the Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. provide lectures and courses at the University of Nebraska Medical Center and, prior to working with NET, received contracts for development of nutrition education materials from the Nebraska Commission on Aging and the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska. It became apparent early in our endeavors that to develop an effective and comprehensive nutrition education program, it is necessary to draw from the expertise in educational psychology, teaching techniques and other skills necessary to facilitate learning. The Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. joined forces with Experience Education, Red Oak, Iowa, a not-for-profit organization founded by educators for the purpose of developing innovative and effective educational materials.

However, because we are private enterprises, we are outsiders to the education system. It was apparent there was a missing link—access to and understanding of the education network and system. In 1976, staff members from Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc., Experience Education, and the Nebraska Department of Education Child Nutrition Programs met to discuss the need for a comprehensive nutrition education program in the school system. In 1978, the NET Program provided the missing link for development of such a program. The NET Program made possible the necessary network between private enterprise and the education system for implementation of an effective nutrition education program. The NET Program Coordinator can facilitate the necessary steps with speed and accuracy impossible by an outsider. For a private agency to initiate such a large scale nutrition education program without a person such as a NET Coordinator and without direct access to the school network would be next to impossible.

Development of a truly comprehensive and effective nutrition education program requires expertise from many disciplines and capabilities beyond those possible from any one organization. The requirements and demands for implementation and continuation of such a program are excessive. The collaboration of the public and private sector enabled us to meet those demands.

A program that utilizes the lunchroom as a learning laboratory and coordinates classroom education with lunchroom education must involve many people. Nutritionists are needed to provide nutrition content and theory. Educators are needed at all levels—educators with expertise in teaching children and those with expertise in training adults. Educational evaluators and production people, such as artists, writers, printers, layout and design personnel are all necessary. School administrators, food service directors, and teachers are necessary to develop and field test a program which will complement current curriculums and be practical to implement.

Previous experiences with nutrition education programs in Nebraska and needs assessment data made it clear that administrators hesitate to support teaching nutrition as a separate subject in view of pressure to concentrate on basic skills. Teachers do not have the ability to evaluate content of nutrition education materials or the time to devote to creating student activities or materials. Therefore, nutrition has to be integrated into the existing system—reading, math, history, science, health. These experiences also illustrated that the lunchroom can be a learning laboratory and that food service personnel are willing to become involved in teaching children about food, but they require specific training and tools. It is not common to find a single organization that employs personnel with expertise to meet identified needs in all of these areas. Therefore, the merger of agencies and organizations make possible the expertise which can identify and carry out the many concurrent activities required for expeditious development of a nutrition education program which addresses all of these concerns.

Technical capabilities as well as professional expertise is essential to development of a comprehensive, practical program. Both the public and private sector contribute unique capabilities. Needs assessment on which a program should be based can best be conducted by the public employees who are in contact with appropriate personnel and have access to necessary records. The public employee is in a position to communicate with principals, supervisors, teachers, school food service personnel and others as needed for insuring a successful program.

Another component of a successful program is the ability to recruit professional, technical and production assistance regarding specific aspects of program development, evaluation and dissemination. Private organizations are able to identify providers of the required talents, direct the use of these resources in specified activities on a temporary basis; for example, hiring the appropriate number of people for production purposes on a one time basis. In developing new programs there must be the ability to make decisions and react quickly to unexpected events. Private nonprofit organizations many times are relatively small and less formal in structure. Therefore, they can accommodate the freedom, flexibility, and creativity which are essential to the developmental process.

In view of all of these needs and conditions, the Nebraska Department of Education, Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc., and Experience Education joined forces to develop the comprehensive, flexible, innovative and practical program we felt Nebraska schools needed. From 1978 to the present time a variety of nutrition information materials have been developed for students, food service personnel, teachers, parents, and community outreach (see Appendages). Education programs for students and training programs for food service personnel are being field tested, revised, and expanded on a voluntary basis.

Another illustration of how such a union can result in programs not otherwise possible is exemplified by a project that will hopefully be developed by the Nebraska Department of Education Child Nutrition Programs, Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc., and Experience Education in the next two years. The Nebraska Department of Education plans to extend the present NET Program in several areas. One is in the area of health and physical fitness and nutrition for athletes. The Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. has an agreement with the U.S. Olympic Committee to develop nutrition education materials for the U.S. Olympic Committee. It has been agreed by the U.S. Olympic Committee and Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. that materials developed for the Olympic Committee could also be used in schools, colleges, and universities. Nutrition education materials developed for Olympic athletes will have an added appeal to young children and teenagers. Therefore, a program developed independently by the Nebraska Department of Education would not have the added charisma that Swanson Center for Nutrition can bring to it. Such a program undertaken solely by the Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. would lack the necessary State personnel input for development, field testing, and implementation.

Funding is also a factor. The Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc. will modify materials rather than develop materials, resulting in a substantial savings.

I have drawn upon my personal experiences to share with you and hopefully exemplify how public moneys from the NET Program have been combined with private funds to result in a program that is serving the nation in a positive way. A program that would not have been possible without this merger or without the NET Program.

APPENDAGE

The kindergarten through six grade learning system jointly developed and evaluated by the Nebraska Department of Education, NET Program, Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc., and Experience Education has been identified as "Experience Nutrition". "Experience Nutrition" is a complete system of eleven exploration packages designed on the premise that nutrition is a basic skill and therefore should not be taught as a separate class, but should be incorporated into all areas of learning. The "Experience Nutrition" series utilizes a variety of formats—puzzles, field trips, dancing, scavenger hunts, card games, puppetry, filmstrips, charades, et cetera—to educate children. Through hands-on food learning experiences, children learn to stir-fry vegetables, knead bread, shape pretzels, mix sandwich filling, taste-test cereals, and plan school lunch menus. Children learn about feeding a small family as well as quantity cookery by visiting the school cafeteria and kitchen to learn what is involved in the school lunch program. Two packages are specifically designed to involve students with school food service staff, although all eleven packages have school food service components.

A "package" includes all software and most other items required for conducting activities, thus, reducing preparation time for the teachers. Packages average 12-20 hours of classroom or cafeteria activity which may be used at one or several grade levels for a time span determined by teachers, principals, and school food service personnel. This hands-on curriculum includes all materials needed for a class of thirty students and is reusable year after year. Master sheets of expendable activity sheets are provided in the teacher's guide for duplicating purposes, or the activity sheets can be reordered. Each package contains a teacher's guide and food service supervisor's guide.

The Experience Nutrition series is designed for use in grades kindergarten through six. Package titles and suggested grade levels are as follows:

K-3	*4-6*
Vegetables	Food advertising
Fruits	Food safety
Breakfst	Great school menus
Snacks	Food habits
Making meals at school	Key nutrients
	Physical fitness and nutrition

NEBRASKA—NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING—PROGRAM STATUS REPORT—MARCH 21, 1980

The Nutrition Education and Training Program is currently in its third fiscal year of operation. Due to delays in development of federal regulations, funding for fiscal year 1978 became available in August 1978. Program activities were initiated at that time based on a previously completed needs assessment and State Plan of Operation. Long-range goals for the Program were identified as follows:

1. To identify and/or develop experienced based nutrition learning activities which will increase student familiarity with and acceptance of a variety of foods.
2. To assist administrators, teachers and food service personnel in incorporating experienced based nutrition learning activities into their total education program.
3. To provide standard, quality certification training and continuing education for food service personnel in Nebraska schools and institutions.
4. To develop effective methods of including nutrition education in courses for teachers offered by Nebraska schools and institutions of higher education.
5. To utilize a State Advisory Council to provide advice and guidance in the operation of Child Nutrition Programs.

These goals were identified in anticipation that federal program funding would remain constant for a minimum of two fiscal years and on the prediction that funding would remain constant for three or more additional fiscal years. The current legislation under which the Program is operating provided an entitlement of 50 cents per child for fiscal years 1978 and 1979. The Nebraska Department of Education received $180,393.50 for fiscal year 1978 and $178,417.00 for fiscal year 1979 Program activities. Third year funding (fiscal year 1980) was based on appropriations and has been reduced to approximately 39 cents per child. The 1980 apportionment for the Nebraska Nutrition Education and Training Program totals $135,590.00.

At the end of fiscal year 1979, the following major Program activities were completed:

1. Evaluation criteria for reviewing preschool-grade 12 nutrition education materials had been established. A wide variety of materials (including books, filmstrips, and films) had been collected and reviewed.

2. Based on needs assessment findings and on the review of existing materials, student materials for grades K-6 were developed and field tested in January-May 1979. Blair, Kearney, and York Public Schools served as test sites. Extensive evaluation data was collected from students, teachers, food service personnel, administrators and parents during the field test period. The evaluation results indicated that the program was effective in increasing knowledge and food acceptance among participating students. The program was well received by teachers, administrators, food service managers and parents.

3. Based on field test results, the K-6 program materials were revised and prepared for larger scale production. This set of materials has been titled "Experience Nutrition".

4. An ad hoc task force to revise the Certification Curriculum for training of school food service personnel and to identify alternative methods of delivering training was established. The revision process was approximately fifty percent complete as of September 30, 1979.

5. A State Advisory Council for Child Nutrition Programs was established and actively engaged in providing guidance for major activities.

At the present time the following major program activities are in progress:

1. The collection and review of existing materials continues. By August 1980, a publication will be distributed which reports on all reviewed items and provides the evaluation tool to be used by teachers and nutritionists in reviewing additional materials. This publication will be distributed to all Nebraska schools.

2. The field tested K-6 "Experience Nutrition" learning materials, developed as part of the Nebraska program, are currently being implemented in one hundred fifteen public and nonpublic schools in Nebraska reaching 23,000 elementary students. More than two hundred schools have requested access to the materials during second semester of the 1979-80 school year.

3. "Experience Nutrition" materials have also been placed in the School for the Visually Handicapped, School for the Deaf and in selected special education programs. This will allow identification of needed modification to make this program effective in these special situations.

4. The "Experience Nutrition" learning materials are also currently in use in Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, West Virginia, and Washington, D.C. This represents a cooperative effort in sharing ideas and materials and in decreasing program cost. The materials are being evaluated extensively in each of these locations. Evaluation data will be presented to the Office of Education Joint Dissemination Review Panel in an attempt to receive national program validation.

5. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has been charged with evaluating the Nutrition Education and Training Program on a nationwide basis. They must be prepared by July 1980 to report to Congress on the value of the program in effecting children's nutrition knowledge, attitudes and practices. Field test evaluation results from Blair, Kearney, and York showed that children selected foods not previously eaten, and that their knowledge of why they eat what they eat increased. As a result, Nebraska has been selected as one of two exemplary programs to illustrate effective nutrition education. This review process started in February 1980 with collection of pre-program data. Post-program data will be collected in May 1980. Twenty-three schools are participating in this extensive evaluation program.

6. Development of nutrition related career materials for secondary students is underway. Three learning packages are being designed. Topical outlines are as follows:

Food technology and nutrition research.—Food analysis, Human nutrition research, Food product development, and world food supply.

Helping special groups.—Prenatal—infants and young children, the elderly, low-income persons, junior high/high school, pre-school/elementary, medical patients, and the obese.

Consumer services.—Quality control, labeling a food product, grocery store management, food service management, and food preparation.

7. Revision of the Certification Curriculum is near completion. Training materials to assist with course instruction are being developed. Implementation of the revised

curriculum is scheduled to begin, on a trial basis, in June 1980 through the University of Nebraska.

Program activities have been coordinated effectively with on-going programs of other agencies and organizations. Collaborative efforts have occurred with the State Department of Welfare, State Department of Health, University of Nebraska College of Business, University of Nebraska College of Home Economics, Southeast Nebraska Technical Community College, and Swanson Center for Nutrition, Inc.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL J. GEBHARDT, M.D., HARDIN, MONT.

I am a 1970 graduate of the University of Oregon Medical School in Portland, Oregon. For the last ten years, I have been engaged in rural general practice in Southeastern Montana. During this period of time I have spent one year as medical officer on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation in Lame Deer, Montana, and devoted the remainder of the time to general practice in Hardin, Montana, a community of approximately 4,000, surrounded by the Crow Indian Reservation. This practice involves caring for the Northern Cheyenne and Crow Indians as well as rural ranch and farm workers and their families. The total number of people served is approximately 9,000. Since coming to Southeastern Montana, a sparsely populated rural area, I have become very familiar with the socio-economic backgrounds and conditions of the people, and see WIC participants on a daily basis. My arrival came approximately 3 years prior to the initiation of the WIC program. The following is a list of medical conditions I found prior to WIC on the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservations as well as in the surrounding rural farm and ranch communities. They are as follows:

1. Lack of education on nutrition.
2. Low birth weight babies.
3. Infant and pediatric anemia.
4. Obesity.
5. Children with poor growth patterns.
6. Maternal and perinatal anemia.
7. Absence of education about breast feeding.
8. Poor nutritional status of expectant mothers including:
   (a) excessive weight gain;
   (b) inadequate weight gain; and/or
   (c) inadequate diet of breast feeding mothers.
9. Inadequate use of immunization programs.
10. Inadequate health programs for seasonal ranch workers, migrant farm workers, and socio-economical deprived American Indian families.

The onset and continuation of the WIC program in Southeastern Montana has benefited the Northern Cheyenne and Crow Indian as well as the rural peoples in countless ways. Thousands of women, infants, and children have received services. Some changes attributed to the WIC program which I have seen are:

1. Improvement in nutritional status through nutrition education. When I learn that my patients are on WIC, I know I do not have to worry about their diet. My obstetric patients who participate in WIC (compared to the non-WIC patients) have better weight gain patterns, have a low incidence of anemia, and are more likely to breast feed after delivery. I have also seen fewer low birth weight babies born of WIC mothers than non-WIC mothers. Growth patterns of the infant and children who participate in WIC are more often within the norms than my non-WIC patients. I also see less anemia in my WIC patients compared to non-WIC.
2. Immunization of my patients participating in WIC are kept up to date; whereas, non-WIC patients are getting immunizations on a random basis.
3. I have noticed improvements in the nutritional status and growth patterns of the infants and children of seasonal ranch workers, migrant farm workers, and socio-economically deprived American Indian families while participating in the WIC program.

Again, in my opinion, the most important contribution that has been made thus far by WIC has been that of nutritional education. Never before has there been a program stressing the importance of adequate diet needed during the critical time of growth and development of expectant mothers, infants, and children. There has been a constant stream of appropriately referred patients to my office from the WIC program. This did not exist before the onset of WIC. In an area where there is a vast number of low income pregnant and breast feeding women and children under age 5 who are at nutritional risk, WIC has made vast improvements in their nutritional status and medical well-being. I cannot over emphasize the tremendous relief that the WIC program has brought to those in such a need.

As the population grows, so does the need for preventive health programs such as WIC. I feel preventive health programs such as WIC have made improvements in cutting the cost of health care and encourage proper funding for continuation of this very worthwhile program at the present level. WIC has certainly lightened the workload for those of us engaged in medical practice in the medically deprived areas. I would also like to see additional funding for studying cost-effectiveness of the WIC program. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF SUE CANNING, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEL-MAR-VA RURAL MINISTRIES, DOVER, DEL., AND SUE HOECHSTETTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FARMWORKER ORGANIZATIONS

I am Susan Canning, Director of Delmarva Rural Ministries, a farmworker governed service organization for migrant and seasonal farmworkers located in Dover, Delaware. We have been working with farmworkers and their health needs for several years on the East Coast. With me today is Susan Hoechstetter, food and nutrition director of the National Association of Farmworker Organizations (NAFO), of which Delmarva is a member. Thank you for inviting NAFO to testify before the Senate Agriculture Committee's Nutrition Subcommittee concerning the Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Food Program (WIC). NAFO is an association of approximately 70 farmworker governed organizations throughout the United States who represent the rights of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and also provide services to them.

NAFO discussed the health plight of farmworkers and the general exploitation to which they are subjected in its testimony before this Subcommittee's Hunger hearings in May 1979 and we refer you to that rather lengthy discussion for a good description of the nature of farmworker life. The Subcommittee is probably aware of some of the hunger and malnutrition problems faced by this country's migrant and seasonal farmworker population. They include (as listed in the January 1980 report to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) National Advisory Council on National, Infant and Fetal Nutrition by its migrant representative, Samuel Byrd):

Infant mortality among migrant farmworkers which is 24 percent higher than the national average;

Incidence of infectious diseases evidenced as 20 percent higher among migrants than among other groups in our society;

Migrant births outside of hospitals occurring at a rate nine times higher than the national average; and

Incidence of malnutrition (prenatal, postnatal and childhood anemia) which is higher among migrants than any other subpopulation in the country.

In addition, the tools available to most of the population to fight hunger problems, the federal food programs, are not easily accessible to the migrant farmworker population. The Field Foundation reported to this Subcommittee last Spring that migrants and their children receive the lowest level of participation in all of the food programs.

The WIC program with its focus on health and nutrition can be important in changing this dire situation. In 1978 Congress passed the Child Nutrition Amendments which reauthorized an expanded WIC Program and increased funding for migrant farmworkers. USDA has taken some actions in the interest of implementing the legislation to meet the needs of migrant farmworkers. However, the actions have been designed to assist a stable population and have therefore been much less effective than they could be for migrant farmworkers.

Farmworkers who have been placed on the WIC Program experience many problems receiving continuous benefits as they move in the course of their work year. When workers come to a new WIC project they are often met by a series of delays, preventing them from receiving the benefits which they need promptly before moving on again. Reasons for the delays include:

LACK OF PROGRAM UNIFORMITY

Information on the verification of certification (VOC) card that the migrant received from the WIC Program in their last State or project area visited is often not the same information required on the new State's VOC card. Because each State may draw up its own VOC, lack of proper information has caused delays and sometimes non-delivery of WIC benefits. Often the information on the VOC's may match the information required in the new area but the requirements for determining who is at nutritional risk may be different. Barriers are then again raised to farmworkers receiving continuous WIC benefits according to the Texas Rural Legal Assistance (TRLA) Program. They (TRLA) found last year that many migrants who were on the WIC Program last year and traveled in the Midwestern Stream were not allowed to continue on the program in Michigan or experience recertification delays because their hematocrit levels did not meet the Michigan standards which were different from those of Texas. Lack of a standard definition among the different States of who is a migrant farmworker also creates difficulties for providing continuity of services. USDA targeted migrants in some ways in 1979, in an effort to make the program more accessable to them. Some farmworkers who traveled in the stream were able to get WIC certification while they were working in the fields up North under their migrant status; but were not classified as migrants when they returned to their home-base states of Florida, Texas or California for the winter months. They were thus put on waiting lists in parts of these states where funds were available for migrants and they stopped receiving benefits. The different migrant definitions also make any special funds or program targeting of migrants ineffective.

AVAILABILITY OF FLEXIBLE FUNDS

Migrants face the WIC funding problems the same as the rest of the population only more often. They may not be in area long enough to receive funds if there is a waiting list. Once receiving WIC benefits that migrant may move to a new area where there are not available slots and again be put off the program. As described in Sam Byrd's report to the National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant and Fetal Nutrition; use of the current WIC funding methods restricts migrant farmworkers because they are not included in the funding formula. They therefore should receive special funding. Twice in 1979 and once in 1980, the Department made special allocations available for serving migrants; states applied for those funds. States were not given much lead time to apply for those funds. In 1979 a total of 25 States applied for special migrant funds and that did not include all of the States with high migrant impact areas. USDA made a positive step in providing special funds for migrants but they did so with no assurances that the States who received those special allocations would receive adequate funds to serve migrants the next year. Some States who received special allocations also complained that the funds came after the migrants had left their State. And it is questionable as to what degree the States who did not request funds served farmworkers. Of course WIC programs could not have expected to improve their services to migrants without doing some outreach. There was no outreach money tied to those allocations. Another reason that the special migrant allocation did not work very well was that monies could not be shifted from State-to-State as needed due to the unexpected changes in the migrant stream.

GENERAL ACCESS

Migrant farmworkers often live in rural areas that are difficult to reach. They work long hours and the work is not restricted to one family member. Therefore, it is difficult to take the time from work to get to the WIC clinic which is often quite far away, if in the area at all, to apply for benefits. There is a need for more WIC Programs and a way for more migrant health clinics and farmworker organizations who are interested to be given the opportunity to operate WIC Programs for farmworkers. In addition, migrants can only effectively participate in the program if benefits are provided with some promptness, that is, before the migrant moves on to a new project area. In Georgia last year, according to the Georgia Legal Services Program, a migrant farmworker couple brought their 5 month old infant to the local WIC office for assistance in acquiring the special formula of milk that their baby needed. The WIC office advised the parents that death might result if the infant did not receive its milk immediately. Unfortunately the WIC office was unable to provide assistance because this particular office only screened infants for WIC on Wednesday and this situation occurred on Thursday. The WIC Program had just received their special migrant allocations and so they had no time to hire staff and do effective outreach before the migrants cane into the area. The baby did go into critical condition.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS OF WIC SERVICES TO MIGRANTS

First, adequate funding of the WIC Program is a prequisite for effective participation of any population group in the WIC Program. NAFO supports the funding levels originally proposed by the Administration for 1981 and 1982 without any cuts. In order to resolve the problems migrant farmworkers face as a result of the variety in different State operations of their WIC programs and to make funds available for migrant participation when and where needed, USDA must move towards federalizing the program for migrants. This idea was recommended to the Nutrition Subcommittee in 1974 when the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs recommended in their Natural Policy Study Report and Recommendations VIII: "The first recommendation therefore, calls for the complete federalization of Federal food programs as they apply to Indians and migrants through the creation within USDA of an Indian and Migrant Program Division."

Indians have reached that level in the program, and it is time that migrants achieve that as well. The Secretary of Agriculture must ensure that funds will be available to meet more of the needs of the migrant farmworker population by appropriating monies at a national level for use only in serving migrants. And the Secretary must also establish regulations that each State would use to determine how much money they will each set aside for services to migrant farmworkers. Those regulations would take into account the number and length of time migrants are expected to be in each State, the administrative funds necessary to serve migrant farmworkers, and the number of migrant farmworkers currently in the State. Migrant farmworkers as a result of changes in the weather, job orders that don't come through, and other factors that influence crop growth often change their travel plans from what was projected in order to pursue their work. Therefore one reason States must maintain their migrant set aside is so that the monies projected to be spent in one area that migrants unexpectedly left early, for example, are available for use for migrants who may unexpectedly be present at another time in another part of the State. In the same way, the Secretary of Agriculture must keep those funds available at a national level for migrants as each year he or she will have to shift those funds due to unexpected shifts in migrants travel from State to State. Of course if there are migrant funds that are not projected to be used by migrants during the fiscal year they should be reallocated giving first preference to States that need additional funds to serve farmworkers. NAFO feels that the philosophy of setting aside funds in this manner along with setting uniform guidelines for migrants throughout the country is the only manner in which migrants can receive effective access to the WIC program.

We would like to discuss one aspect of this proposal that may be unclear. We are suggesting that every migrant farmworker once receiving WIC benefits automatically continue to receive benefits on a timely basis in a new project area just as he or she would if they had stayed in the old project area. We are not suggesting that every farmworker who is not receiving and applies for WIC benefits receives them while the rest of the population does not have the same opportunity. But special plans are necessary for the entire migrant population.

The Secretary must set down the procedures that would allow a migrant farmworker who has been participating in the WIC Program to continue to receive benefits on a timely basis in a new State or project area that they have entered where there is a WIC Program. The Secretary must also set down one definition of a migrant farmworker which every State must use.

In addition the Secretary should review and evaluate each States projections of migrant funding (based on the formula established by the Secretary) and ensure that those funds are used on behalf of migrants. The States should submit with those projections plans for serving migrants that include plans for opening new and expanding existing WIC Programs in areas where migrants or seasonal farmworkers work or reside. Preference for funding these new and/or expanded programs should go to migrant health clinics and farmworker organizations. Currently, these organizations although usually the groups most in touch with the farmworker population find if extremely difficult to receive consideration for becoming WIC Program operators. States should also initiate outreach programs to reach migrant and seasonal farmworkers and again do so in conjunction with migrant and seasonal farmworker organizations. And States should be authorized to recompense those organizations for their work. In order to make all of the above State planning as accurate as possible, it should be done in conjunction with migrant and seasonal farmworker organizations.

Nutrition education for migrants could also be a more valuable part of the WIC Program with the following improvements:

A Nutrition Education System for migrants based on core curriculum and which can be utilized at whichever stage of the curriculum the migrant is at wherever she or he participates in the WIC Program;

The Nutrition Education Program should take into account the language(s) and the culture(s) of the migrants served.

The bilingual requirements of the WIC Program should be strengthened also and could be based on the requirements now existing in the food stamp program.

Finally, these changes can be achieved most effectively with input from those most affected, migrant and seasonal farmworker representatives. USDA should do so. We appreciate this opportunity to share our suggestions for the WIC Program that have resulted from much discussion of farmworker representatives around the country. We ask that the Committee take leadership to achieve improvements for migrants based on these suggestions. Thank you and we would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN FRIDY, DIRECTOR, CONSUMER AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman, I am Susan Fridy, Director of Consumer and Nutrition Programs and Legislative Representative of the National Milk Producers Federation. The membership of the Federation is comprised of dairy cooperatives representing their dairy farmer owners doing business in every state in the nation. As this committee well knows, the milk producers of this country have supported the child nutrition programs for years.

Our membership has been active in the establishment and growth of the National School Lunch Program as well as the Breakfast; Summer Feeding; Women, Infants and Children and Child Care Food Programs. We are particularly proud of our role in the development of the Special Milk Program to provide school children a half-pint of milk at reduced prices, free to needy children, to encourage their consumption of nutritious fluid milk. Among other issues, we have supported equipment assistance, commodity donation, nutrition education, on-site preparation of meals, and the maintenance of the traditional nutritional excellence of these programs.

I am pleased to come before you today in support of full funding for all the child nutrition programs in order to reach all eligible children. These programs have been developed over the years to promote the nutritional well-being of the nation's children. In addition to providing an essential portion of a child's daily nutrient intake, the child feeding programs serve as an educational tool in that they provide a living model of good eating habits to stimulate a lifetime of proper nutrition.

The child nutrition programs are important not only to the health and well-being of the people of our nation, they also make an important contribution to the agricultural economy. The child nutrition programs began as economic stimulants to faltering commodity prices. We are pleased that these programs are now rightfully recognized as essential to the welfare of the participating children, but at the same time it is important that we remember that the programs serve an important need of the agricultural community as well.

Foods used in the child Nutrition Programs help maintain a stable market for the commodities produced by the American Farmer. Additionally, the commodity donation program serves not only to assure a stable market, but is one of the price stabilizing tools of the Department of Agriculture. The commodity distribution program provides a significant outlet for dairy products purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation in that it is estimated 99 percent of cheese, 80 percent of butter, and 12–14 percent of nonfat dry milk donated by CCC will be used by the child nutrition programs in fiscal year 1981. The current success of the nonfat dry milk bonus donation program testifies to the desirability and usefulness of foods acquired by schools through commodity donations. Prices are stabilized for other commodities by spot market purchases. These foods are also distributed to schools for use in the feeding programs.

The National Milk Producers Federation has been an active member of the recently organized Child Nutrition Coalition. The Coalition is comprised of more than 40 groups representing education, nutrition, health, agriculture, advocacy, food industry, public interest, and food service organizations joined together for the sole goal of encouraging full funding of all the child nutrition programs in order to reach all eligible children. We believe the Coalition has been an effective voice united to emphasize the importance of the child nutrition programs to the nation's children.

The membership of the National Milk Producers Federation is alarmed by the proposals of the current administration to curtail funding of a number of the child nutrition programs. In particular, the nickel reduction in funding to the paying child for each lunch served through the National School Lunch Program and the redefinition of the eligibility guidelines for free and reduced price lunches are penny-wise and pound foolish. Schools are already hard-pressed to produce high-quality meals at an affordable price to children in these times of inflated prices. The Federal government has made a commitment of partnership with states and local school districts through the School Lunch Program. The proposed budgetary cutbacks represent an abandonment of that commitment.

The "safety-net" factor proposed by USDA is nothing more than a rhetorical ploy in contending that if participation by the paying child drops to less than 50 percent nationally in comparison with free and reduced-price lunch children, that the nickel cut will be reinstated. USDA itself has stated that the computations for reinstating the 5 cents would require a year's statistics which, of course, would mean that the nickel cut would be in operation for two years before amends to the program funding would be made.

We realize the pressure our nation faces to take meaningful action to stabilize our economy, but we firmly believe that the proposals to use the child nutrition programs to balance the budget will have nothing but negative effects. If the safeguards for our citizenry's well-being are undermined in efforts to balance the budget, we face the possibility of devastatingly hard times for our people.

We are not pleased with the proposed $55.7 million reduction in funding for the Special Milk Program. This program has been targeted by the administration for the past several years with proposals to severely cut back the program. The Senate considered the merits of the Special Milk Program last year in a lengthy debate which concluded that the program fills an important gap in the child nutrition programs. The debate clearly express the will of the Senate to maintain the Special Milk Program and therefore make low cost milk available to all children in schools choosing to participate in the program. Statistics show that 70 percent of the milk consumed in the Special Milk Program goes to children who do not receive milk through any other program; 12 percent of Special Milk consumed by senior high school students is bought by boys and girls who eat no lunch at all—but they are encouraged to at least drink a carton of milk.

In addition to our concern for full funding of the child nutrition programs and maintenance of eligibility guidelines for the poor, the National Milk Producers Federation is concerned about some of the changes in regulation by the Food and Nutrition Service which are undermining the nutritional excellence of the Type A lunch and other child nutrition meal patterns.

Recent regulations published in final form in the Federal Register alter the definition milk component of the Type A lunch and create a situation where whole milk is discriminated against the children are left in many cases with no choice. When the Type A lunch was established and milk chosen as one of its required components, whole fluid milk was recognzied for its nutritional superiority and contribution to the diet of growing children. A number of years ago, the Food and Nutrition Service amended the definition of milk used in the child nutrition programs to include lowfat, skim, and buttermilk. The Federation did not oppose this change because we recognize the importance of choice to children participating in the program. However several months ago when final regulations were published regarding the Type A lunch and the definition of milk, we were shocked to find that the Department of Agriculture now requires the service of lowfat, skim, or buttermilk with the Type A lunch and that whole milk is reduced to an option of the school.

It is our understanding that many schools are offering only skim milk. Many children will not drink skim milk, preferring the body and taste of whole milk. The school "saves" money by buying the cheaper milk and by serving less milk because the children don't like it. This is unfair to children. We are sure that the proponents of the original Dietary Goals did not have such a rigid interpretation of the recommendation to reduce fats in mind.

It seems the dairy industry is being singled out by the Food and Nutrition Service through the regulatory process. Butter was deleted as a component of the Type A lunch, whole milk is discriminated against, and imitation cheeses can be used for up to 50 percent of the cheese served through the school lunch program. Meanwhile, many foods of questionable nutritional value are served, many with high fat contents. We therefore request this committee to include language in the bill to be developed from these hearings to assure that 100 percent natural cheeses made from pure whole milk will be used in the School Lunch Program and that children will be offered whole fluid milk as a first choice when milk is made available through any of the child nutrition programs.

Full funding of the child nutrition programs is important for children and it is important for the agricultural economy. There is one reduction planned by the Department of Agriculture, however, that may slip through without fanfare because it will not require an amendment of law. The Food and Nutrition Service, in the interest of encouraging schools to start breakfast programs, has been donating 3 cents worth of commodities to schools for each breakfast served. Because this is not required by law, FNS plans to quietly drop the breakfast commodity donation. Many of the commodities donated for use in the breakfast program are already purchased and paid for by USDA. The foods would therefore simply sit as government stocks. Once again, the Federal government would renege its partnership for the child nutrition programs with the state and local governments. We encourage you to take an active role in assuring schools that the 3 cent breakfast commodity donation will remain in effect.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice our concern regarding funding of the child nutrition programs. We have always enjoyed working with this Committee on these and other programs and are assured that the Committee will develop legislation which will indeed be in the best interest of the child nutrition programs and the people of this nation.

[The following material was submitted by Barbara Bode, president, the Children's Foundation:]

Response to Specific School Food Proposals

SECTION 4 CUTS

The Administration proposed to cut the rate of Federal reimbursement for the paying child by 5 cents—almost one-third of the current level of support. Because section 4 funds provide the basis for state matching funds, in some states, the reduction at the Federal level will mean an additional reduction of school lunch funding at the state level. Even without cuts at the Federal or State level, inflation related rising costs are causing many school districts to increase their prices to paying children from 5-20 cents per meal. For example, school officials in Eugene, Oregon have proposed a lunch price increase of 15 cents and elimination of on-site preparation in 20 of its 46 schools. If the Federal cut passes, the district plans a 20 cent lunch price increase and the elimination of school breakfast and special milk programs in hopes of ensuring the survival of the lunch program.

USDA estimates that a five cent increase in school lunch price leads to a 4 percent decrease in participation. This means that school districts may see participation fall by as much as 20 percent in areas where local budget problems are already forcing lunch price increases. Decreases in participation will have many serious effects.

First, it means that many children will stop eating what could be the only truly nutritious meal they have all day. It also could have serious spin-off effects. Food service employment is directly related to the number of meals served. With a decrease, many low income food service workers would almost surely lose their jobs.

Schools buy most of the food they serve in their lunch programs locally. With a decrease in participation they will buy less food, adversely affecting local companies and their employees, and the local economy.

In addition, efficiency in food service increases as volume increases. There is better productivity and a lower unit cost at higher participation levels. This will be undermined by a participation decrease.

The long-range effects of the section 4 cut could even be more damaging. The Administration's budget-cutting methods show a disturbing tendency to turn the Child Nutrition Programs toward becoming welfare-oriented. If this happens, it could lead to their downfall. If the programs are run only for the needy, many school districts may simply stop operating because the total participation would not be great enough to warrant operation. And then the needy child would truly lose out. The great success of the lunch program has always been and continues to be attributable to the fact that it provides low-cost, high-quality nutritious meals to all children as part of the educational process itself.

SAFETY NET

The Administration claims to have devised a "safety net" which would restore funding if paid participation in the lunch program drops below 50 percent nationally. The proposal avoids discussion of USDA estimates that if the eligibility cuts were made, 65 percent of the children remaining in the program would full into the paid category. Thus, if USDA projections are correct, lunch programs would have to survive a year with a 15 percent drop in participation before funds could be restored. USDA School Program officials have admitted privately that USDA does not have the capability to collect and analyze participation data after schools close in June and enact any funding policy by the time schools reopen in September. Even if USDA could restore funding, it would come too late for the food programs that were discontinued because of problems created by these cuts.

The Administration has simply not given careful consideration to the serious adverse effects its proposals could have on the lunch program. The commitment of the Congress has been and should continue to be to make the School Lunch Program the most effective program possible, which demands that it benefit all of the Nation's school children.

FREE AND REDUCED-PRICED ELIGIBILITY

The Administration proposes new legislation which would tighten eligibility requirements for free meals from 125 percent of the poverty line to 100 percent and for reduced-priced meals from 195 percent to 175 percent.

These changes would hit hardest the lower income family which can least afford it. For those in the 175–195 percent range, it would mean an enormous increase, from the current reduced price cost to the new full price cost augmented by rampant inflation and the Administration's section 4 cut.

More than one million children would be dropped from the free lunch program, and hundreds of thousands of children from lower income families would have to pay full price for their meals.

If USDA projections are accurate, the effects of the changes on participation could be devastating. USDA estimates that one-fourth of those in the 100–125 percent range will drop out of the lunch program and one-half of those in the 175–195 percent range will drop out. These are children for whom a nutritious lunch cannot be considered a disposable luxury.

NUTRITION EDUCATION

The Administration proposed to cut funding for nutrition education and training through the appropriations process by $5 million—25 percent of current levels. It is particularly disappointing that the Administration proposes to do this without even waiting for the results of its current nutrition education studies and demonstration projects. This indicates a lack of appreciation of the importance of the issue. Our future health is closely tied to nutition. The N.E.T. Program strengthens the School Lunch, School Breakfast and Child Care Food Programs by creating greater acceptance of the food served and improving the kinds and quality of food served in these programs. It is imperative that we maintain a strong commitment in this area and that we utilize the living laboratory of the school lunchroom to bring this crucial component of education to the nation's children.

EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE CUT

There is a need for more equipment assistance funding. Some states now have two year waiting lists for reserved funds needed to initiate a breakfast or lunch program and many schools have ancient equipment which needs replacement. For example, the Granite School District in Utah built its central kitchen in 1949 with a planned capacity of 10,000 lunches per day. This same kitchen is now serving 35,000 lunches per day and cannot initiate a breakfast program because the kitchen is already stretched beyond capacity and funds will not be available for equipment assistance until 1982. Here in the District of Columbia, children at 76 schools must eat frozen pre-plated meals because equipment money is unavailable to upgrade meal service. These children must settle for variety limited to 14 different lunches and 8 different breakfasts for an entire school year.

BREAKFAST COMMODITY CUT

Since there is no legislation authorizing commodities for the Breakfast Program, OMB decided that USDA could save $19 million dollars by eliminating the purchase or eggs and juices used in the program. This cut will damage both existing breakfast programs and school breakfast expansion. It sends a message to school administrators that the Federal government is withdrawing support from the program. Schools need these commodities to keep the breakfast program self-supporting.

We request, therefore, that your committee provide authorization for the purchase of breakfast commodities. To assure that a new paperwork burden is not created by this authorization, the authorization should contain a clause that commodities provided under the SBP or NXLP can be used in either program.

EFFECT OF CUTS ON SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM EXPANSION

A side-effect of the proposed cuts in child nutrition has been noticed by people working to initiate lunch and breakfast programs in the past year. In interview after interview, school administrators have said, "How can you ask us to start this program when the government is already planning to cut funds?" The cutback proposals exacerbate fears that local schools will be left to pay for the food programs by themselves in just a few years.

To counteract the impact of the proposed cuts on school breakfast expansion, we urge the committee to reaffirm its commitment to the breakfast program and breakfast expansion by providing "severe need" rates to all schools with costs greater than the regular reimbursement and providing parents with access to reliable information about the School Breakfast Program. One provision we would like to ask the committee to consider for inclusion in its bill for reauthorization of child nutrition programs this year would require school boards to request a feasibility study from the state and to hold a public hearing on School Breakfast if 50 parents request implementation of the program. This would require no new paperwork, and would not take the final decision away from the school board but it would guarantee that more information makes its way into the school district and that the School Breakfast Program gets a fair hearing.

It would eliminate the current situation where school officials, opposed to the program for philosophical reasons, greatly exaggerate the costs and problems involved in school breakfast implementation while the state agency remains silent because they can not become involved without a formal invitation from the school administration. In Milwaukee, the largest major city without a school breakfast program, a tremendous battle is taking place. School administrators, refusing to consult with the state agency, are claiming that the School Breakfast Program would cost 90 cents per meal. Even though this projected cost is much higher than any other School Breakfast Program in the country, parents and advocates in Milwaukee cannot get assistance from the state agency in providing more accurate cost projections. Meanwhile education dollars are wasted on the hungry children attending school in Milwaukee.

TWO SIMPLE MEASURES TOWARD SALVAGING THE SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM IN 1981

These two recommendations for 1981 SFSPC legislation would allow USDA to encourage more schools to sponsor the program, to reduce the probability of fraud and abuse while guarding against the unnecessary loss of this service to children.

1. A February 1 application deadline for public institution (school districts, school boards, public schools) to retain priority status for approval as SFSPC sponsors.

After February 1st, the State administrators shall approve the most capable sponsors applicants from the next category. (See page 24 of the attached regulations.)

Public institutions shall be required to file written "statements of intent" to sponsor the Program during the next Program period.

This statement must be public information.

Applicant sponsors must be informed by state administrators when they apply that the public institution(s) in their areas has/have not filed a "letter of intent". Preferably, copies should be given to applicant sponsors.

Applicant sponsors applying after February 1st from areas where there has been no capable school applicant, must be informed that the state administrators must approve capable sponsors from the next category after it has been documented that the local school is not interested in sponsorship.

In areas where schools have accepted SFSPC sponsorship, applicant sponsors in the same locality may opt to provide sites, volunteers, or other resources to coordinate with the local school sponsor in maximizing SFSPC services in their community.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDING A LEGISLATED FEBRUARY 1 DEADLINE FOR PROSPECTIVE SCHOOL SPONSORS AND TO REQUIRE A PUBLIC LETTER OF INTENT FROM SCHOOLS WHICH ARE APPLICANT SPONSORS THAT WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO OTHER APPROPRIATE APPLICANT SPONSORS

Public institutions such as schools, school boards, or school districts have not proven to be a reliable source of SFSPC sponsors. Schools have not been eager to cooperate as feeding sites, meal preparation sites, or to provide other resources or assistance to local sponsors. The General Accounting Office (GAO) March 31, 1978, report cited the reasons that most schools will never be a reliable source of facilities for SFSPC meal preparation or meal service in cooperation with other local sponsors.

"Local officials' * * * are often reluctant to permit schools to be used because the schools are traditionally closed during summer and the officials are concerned about vandalism and wear and tear on school buildings."

Would withholding National School Lunch Program funds or other sanctions provide an incentive for more school sponsorship.—The same 1978 GAO report further noted that "some school districts might accept the sanctions—which could have undesirable effects on local school programs—rather than allow their schools to be used for the summer feeding program." These GAO findings fully illustrate the dilemma of searching for incentives to increase school sponsorship.

Schools, school boards, and school districts do not render final decisions on SFSPC sponsorship until it is far too late for the school district or interested local civic organizations to plan a successful program for the summer. In some areas this delay may be due to attitudinal problems that school officials have about the food program or because the board's meeting schedule or financial schedule simply will not accommodate the Program's timeframe.

Whatever the human or beaucratic reasons, it has been the experience of public institutions and community service organizations that SFSPC has to be set up early in the year to maximize the Program's benefits and to reduce the probability for error.

School sponsorship is an important ideal. Other sponsors, however, who are capable, eager, and whose facilities are more likely to be within safe walking distance for young children in low income neighborhoods should be guaranteed adequate time to set up their SFSPC in areas where schools have no intention, capability or facilities to do so. Needless to say, children will go without meals unless schools are forced to decide early in the year about SFSPC sponsorship.

Will the February 1 deadline pose unnecessary hardship on public institutions or state administrators.—Schools are in their mid-year operations by the time the February deadline approaches. As part of the federal and state governmental network, schools are clearly identifiable for outreach by state officials. From September to February, schools have plenty of time to decide and plan—far more than the February to April three month period for other sponsors. Schools do not have the problems of starting completely "from scratch" as do other sponsors. In most cases, their trained staff and inspected facilities are part of a regular routine.

It is not unreasonable to expect schools to come to an early enough decision to allow state administrators to concentrate their outreach training and technical assistance on the sponsors who need their attention most.

What will happen without a February 1 deadline.—Schools will have absolutely no incentive to decide and plan early State outreach efforts will be stymied while state officials await school decisions.

Lower priority sponsors (see attached regulations page 24—there are six (6) categories) will have less time to plan a good program (hiring, training staff, purchasing goods and services, preparing their self-preparation facilities, etc.).

As a result the 1981 national performance record for SFSPC sponsors may show an unnecessary increase in their error rates because, once again they will have had to scurry to be ready for summer.

Interested civic organizations will waste precious time and money reserving their time, staff and facilities while awaiting the local school decision.

In the confusion over sponsorship, hungry children will go unserved.

2. To continue the waiver process that allows private nonprofit institutions which contract with private profitmaking food service management companies (type 6) to provide SFSPC meals in areas where no public institution or service institutions which prepare their own meals are available.

State administrators must have exhausted their outreach efforts for capable sponsor in categories 1–5.

"Type 6 sponsors" must meet the current program requirements for community food service experience, recordkeeping and financial capabilities.

Approval of type 6 sponsors shall continue to be a state administrative responsibility.

Rationale for continuing the waiver process for type 6 sponsors.—

This waiver process would be parallel to the Javits Amendment in Public Law 96-108 enacted November 9, 1979 which guards against the unnecessary loss of SFSPC to needy children by allowing capable type 6 sponsors to be approved in areas where state administrators are unable to find other applicant sponsors types.

SFSPC sponsor error rates in each of the six (6) sponsor categories should be lower for 1980 and 1981 now that USDA has clearer sponsor performance requirements.

SFSPC should be "clear" of unreputable sponsors and food service management companies by 1981 now that USDA has clearer sponsor performance requirements.

SFSPC should be "clear" of unreputable sponsors and food service management companies by 1981 as a result of 1980 regulations. Eligible organizations with documented capability or performance records should be allowed SFSPC sponsorship. Eligible children deserve capable sponsors regardless of the type method of meal preparation or delivery that sponsors must employ to meet the needs of these hungry children.

It is unrealistic to expect low-budgeted civic organizations to go into debt purchasing appliances or facilities to prepare meals for a program which has an average operation period of 56 days.

Would the continuation of the waiver process increase state administrative responsibilities or lower program standards for sponsor performance requirements.—
The 1979 SFSPC regulations already give state administrators the authority to judge applicant sponsor capabilities during their initial visit to applicant sponsor facilities.

The existing criteria for reviewing applicant sponsors according to their regulated priorities (see attached 1980 USDA regulations, page 24) would ensure that state administrative outreach efforts have been exhausted in each preceding category before sponsors in the lower categories are approved.

This waiver process (as outlined in the 1980 legislation and regulations) should be continued to ensure that children will not be unnecessarily penalized by the Administration's proposed sponsorship restrictions to control program fraud and abuse.

This waiver process should continue to be a state option. The 1980 SFSPC record can be used to examine the feasibility of continuing this process in 1981 and later years.

What will happen if this waiver process is not continued in 1981.—The requirement for type 6 sponsors are clearly spelled out in the regulations as a guide for state administrators. Certainly, most state administrators are capable enough to continue to decide who is able to serve adequately and who is not.

Without this waiver process the number of children served in major cities will be sharply reduced because few civic organizations have summer programs that are small enough to fall within the 1500 children/15 site limit for type 6 sponsors (see type 5) that is proposed by the Administration for 1981-83. Again, this is a 56 day annual Program that does not reimburse sponsors for purchasing appliances for food preparation or meal service or for construction to alter facilities to make them suitable meal preparation sites.

SUMMARY

In this time of inflation and government belt-tightening, we sympathize with efforts to maximize the efficient use of available funds and, where possible, reduce costs. But we cannot support plans that could undermine the heart of the Child Nutrition Programs or damage their fundamental purpose of providing low-costs, high quality nutritious meals to all of the Nation's school children as an important part of the education process.

The Administration's legislative proposal to limit eligibility for free and reduced price meals is expected to result in significant decreases in participation, will adversely affect millions of children and will hit hardest those who can least afford it.

The Administration's proposals are a matter of the gravest concern to us. It would be a mistake to implement them at this time while no one knows what their actual effect would be on the operation of the Child Nutrition Programs. They could have repercussions which seriously undermine School Districts' ability to operate them effectively and efficiently. Certainly, until the nutritional impact studies of Child Nutrition Programs (authorized under S. Res. 90) have been completed, any cuts in the Child Nutrition Programs would be highly irresponsible. They could undermine the Nation's investment in the programs themselves and the Nation's commitment to its children.

[The following article was submitted by Mr. Sabatasso. See p. 52 for the oral statement of Mr. Sabatasso.]

PROJECT SMILE FROWNS ON SCHOOL LUNCH BUDGET CUTS

The Food Services Branch of Los Angeles Public Schools, which serves 550,000 meals per day, could lose as much as $16 million of its $100 million annual budget if certain provisions in President Carter's fiscal 1981 budget proposal, and Proposition 9 in California, are passed.

This arresting projection comes from Al Wood, director of the school district's Food Services Branch, who presently is sharpening his pencil to prepare a contingency budget should funding be reduced.

And it is one of the most significant issues confronting Project SMILE (School Meals Industry for Learning and Education) founded by Louis Sabatasso, president of Sabatasso's Pizza. The organization is "dedicated to educating the public to the true merits of school food service programs," Sabatasso proclaims.

He admits to a selfish reason for forming such a group. About 60 percent of his business is done with public school food service programs.

But as the father of seven children, he also is highly motivated by the prospect of thousands of other kids who could be priced out of school lunch programs if government funding is cut.

Al Wood explains his department receives support through the National School Lunch Program two ways: through surplus commodities and through cash subsidies. Both these avenues are threatened in the budget proposal President Carter submitted to Congress Jan. 29, Wood reports.

"The surplus commodities program was designed to serve two functions: It supports farm prices while keeping the cost of school lunches down," Wood explains. "President Carter has recommended a $34-million cut in this program."

Total recommended cuts in the National School Lunch Program under the President's budget plan: $470 million. The balance would come from cash subsidies for the free and reduced price lunch program, Wood adds.

About 67 percent of the students receiving lunch at Los Angeles Public Schools eats free; another 3 percent eats lunch at a reduced price. Eligiblity guidelines for these programs may be changed, Wood reports. He estimates at least 100,000 children could be priced out of the lunch program if President Carter's provisions are passed.

Costs also would rise for youngsters paying full price, Wood adds. "Our experience has shown that every time we raise the price of lunch by a nickel, we lose 17 percent of our participants."

In addition to the specter of federal support being reduced, Wood believes the passage of Proposition 9, "Jarvis II," could reduce State subsidies to school lunch programs by 30 percent or $1.8 million of his district's $6 million in annual State funding.

Wood adds his district stands to lose more than $16 million in State and federal support. "We would have to eliminate other programs, such as our mid-morning milk program and the summer nutrition program for needy children, to be able to sustain the lunch program at all, "Wood cautions. "The loss of support should we drop those programs could push our total loss to $40 million or about 40 percent of our total budget."

The "ripple effect" of such funding curtailment could result in a $240-million loss in business to the district's suppliers.

Since Sabatasso is a significant supplier to the district, indeed to many districts throughout the country, his business could be impacted dramatically.

Several Los Angeles-area school food service industry suppliers already have joined forces with Sabatasso in Project SMILE, as have others from across the nation. From this area: Olson Meat Company, Interstate Restaurant Supply, Larry's Food Products, California Food Sales, Accu-Tab Systems, Douglas Brothers Produce, International Food Service, Sunkist Growers and Taylor Freezers of Southern California.

The group will conduct its first membership meeting March 4. Project SMILE's telephone number is: (714) 840-1341.

[The following table was submitted by Mr. Goodman. See p. 54 for the oral statement of Mr. Goodman.]

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF VARIOUS CUTS IN FEDERAL SPENDING FOR CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

State	Fiscal year 1979 Federal "seed money"	1979 equivalent consumer expenditures (ECE)	Administration proposed Federal "seed money"	Estimated ECE under administration proposals	Economic loss
Alabama	$63,818,000	$274,441,000	$52,841,000	$227,216,000	($47,225,000)
Alaska	2,448,000	10,526,000	2,026,000	8,711,000	(1,815,000)
Arizona	23,083,000	99,257,000	19,112,000	82,181,000	(17,074,000)
Arkansas	30,929,000	132,995,000	25,609,000	110,118,000	(22,876,000)
California	209,346,000	900,188,000	173,338,000	745,353,000	(154,834,000)
Colorado	19,888,000	85,518,000	16,467,000	70,808,000	(14,710,000)
Connecticut	22,225,000	95,567,000	18,402,000	79,128,000	(16,439,000)
Delaware	5,322,000	22,884,000	4,406,000	18,945,000	(3,939,000)
District of Columbia	9,102,000	39,142,000	7,537,000	32,409,000	(6,733,000)
Florida	98,391,000	423,081,000	81,467,000	350,308,000	(72,773,000)
Georgia	80,914,000	347,930,000	66,996,000	288,082,000	(59,848,000)
Guam	1,877,000	8,071,000	1,554,000	6,682,000	(1,389,000)
Hawaii	9,765,000	41,990,000	8,085,000	34,765,000	(7,224,000)
Idaho	6,138,000	26,393,000	5,082,000	21,582,000	(4,541,000)
Illinois	95,806,000	411,965,000	79,327,000	341,106,000	(70,859,000)
Indiana	36,474,000	156,838,000	30,200,000	129,860,000	(26,978,000)
Iowa	23,945,000	102,963,000	19,826,000	85,251,000	(17,712,000)
Kansas	19,096,000	82,112,000	15,811,000	67,987,000	(14,125,000)
Kentucky	53,559,000	230,303,000	44,346,000	190,687,000	(39,616,000)
Louisiana	68,267,000	293,548,000	56,525,000	243,057,000	(50,491,000)

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF VARIOUS CUTS IN FEDERAL SPENDING FOR CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS—Continued

State	Fiscal year 1979 Federal "seed money"	1979 quivalent consumer expenditures (ECE)	Administration proposed Federal "seed money"	Estimated ECE under administration proposals	Economic loss
Maine	$13,136,000	$56,484,000	$10,876,000	$46,766,000	($9,718,000)
Maryland	36,274,000	155,978 000	30,034,000	129,146,000	(26,832,000)
Massachusetts	55,176,000	237,256 000	45,685,000	196,445,000	(40,811,000)
Michigan	68,065,000	292,680,000	56,357,000	242,335,000	(50,344,000)
Minnesota	33,690,000	144,867,000	27,895,000	119,948,000	(24,919,000)
Mississippi	50,339,000	216,457,000	41,680,000	179,224,000	(37,233,000)
Missouri	44,755,000	192,446,000	37,057,000	159,345,000	(33,101,000)
Montana	6,881,000	29,588,000	5,697,000	24,497,000	(5,091,000)
Nebraska	10,744,000	46,199,000	8,896,000	38,252,000	(7,947,000)
Nevada	5,007,000	21,530,000	4,145,000	17,823,000	(3,707,000)
New Hampshire	7,425,000	31,927,000	6,147,000	26,432,000	(5,495,000)
New Jersey	64,007,000	275,230,000	52,997,000	227,887,000	(47,343,000)
New Mexico	19,491,000	83,811,000	16,138,000	69,393,000	(14,418,000)
New York	187,686,000	807,050,000	155,404,000	668,237,000	(138,812,000)
North Carolina	95,137,000	409,089,000	78,773,000	338,723,000	(70,366,000)
North Dakota	4,985,000	21,534,000	4,127,000	17,746,000	(3,689,000)
Ohio	82,252,000	353,683,000	68,104,000	292,847,000	(60,836,000)
Oklahoma	28,910,000	124,313,000	23,937,000	102,929,000	(21,384,000)
Oregon	16,871,000	72,545,000	13,969,000	60,066,000	(12,479,000)
Pennsylvania	93,920,000	403,856,000	77,765,000	334,489,000	(69,467,000)
Pureto Rico	65,066,000	279,783,000	53,874,000	231,658,000	(48,125,000)
Rhode Island	7,855,000	33,776,000	6,503,000	27,962,000	(5,814,000)
American Samoa	1,650,000	7,095,000	1,366,000	5,873,000	(1,222,000)
South Carolina	49,922,000	214,664,000	41,335,000	177,740,000	(36,924,000)
South Dakota	7,674,000	32,998,000	6,354,000	27,332,000	(5,666,000)
Tennessee	56,935,000	244,821,000	47,142,000	202,710,000	(42,110,000)
Texas	178,141,000	766,006,000	147,500,000	634,250,000	(131,756,000)
Trust Territory Northern Marianas	2,772,000	11,920,000	2,295,000	9,868,000	(2,051,000)
Utah	12,468,000	53,612,000	10,323,000	44,388,000	(9,224,000)
Vermont	4,960,000	21,328,000	4,106,000	17,655,000	(3,673,000)
Virginia	48,722,000	209,504,000	40,341,000	173,466,000	(36,038,000)
Virgin Island	2,390,000	10,277,000	1,978,000	8,505,000	(1,772,000)
Washington	25,184,000	108,291,000	20,852,000	89,663,000	(18,628,000)
West Virginia	25,511,000	109,698,000	21,123,000	90,829,000	(18,868,000)
Wisconsin	34,202,000	147,068,000	28,319,000	121,771,000	(25,297,000)
Wyoming	2,536,000	10,904,000	2,099 000	9,025,000	(1,879,000)
Totals	[1] 2,331,133,000	[1] 10,023,880,000	[1] 1,930,120,000	[1] 8,299,631,000	[1] (1,724,241,000)

[1] Not adjusted for rounding off.

STATEMENT OF JEANNE PERRY, CHAIRPERSON, SUMMER MEALS ADVISORY COUNCIL, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

Good morning. My name is Jeanne Perry. I am the Staff Director of the Hunger Task Force at Community Council of Greater New York. I am presenting testimony today on behalf of the Summer Meals Advisory Committee, of which I am chairperson. With me today is John Cimarosa, the President of the Association for Recreation Management, a New York City based association of non-profit agency summer camps. The Summer Meals Advisory Committee was established in May, 1978 by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office of the United States Department of Agriculture, to provide for citizen input into USDA's administration of the Summer Food Service Program for children in New York City.

In addition to the testimony prepared for today, I am submitting, for the record, testimony which was prepared for the House (Education and Labor Committee) Subcommittee on Elementary Secondary and Vocational Education. That testimony was prepared before we had seen the specifics of the Administration's proposed bill. I would like to spend this time addressing two specific aspects of that bill: State Administration; and Limitation on vended programs. Mr. Cimarosa and I will then be happy to answer any questions you might have.

As background, I would like to mention a few relevant New York City statistics: One out of every four New York City children, or about 600,000 children, live in families which receive Public Assistance. (These families receive $2.08 per person per day for all expenses except rent.)

According to most recent Census data, over 1 million New York City children live in families with incomes under 195 percent of the poverty line. Each one of these 1 million children is eligible for the Summer Food program.

This program was created in recognition of the importance of providing meals to those low-income children who during the summer months lose school meals benefits. We believe that it remains an important program for children and one which deserves the commitment of Congress and the USDA.

I. STATE VERSUS U.S.D.A. ADMINISTRATION

A. We urge the Subcommittee to support a provision which would allow the U.S.D.A. to administer the program in states which are unwilling or unable to administer it themselves.

B. We support the provision in the Administration's bill which provides for additional administrative funds to be made available to states which can demonstrate need. We are concerned however, that last-minute negotiations for these additional funds may impede timely and effective planning and administration of the program. Therefore, we urge that a formula be developed which would allow states to anticipate their costs early in the planning stages and receive a commitment from USDA to the specific amount of additional funds they would receive for a certain size program.

For more populated states, the need for year-round staffing ought to be recognized. This is a requirement if outreach, training, inspections, and approvals are to occur on a timely basis. The funds required for this should therefore be allowed in any additional funding formula.

II. LIMITATION ON VENDED PROGRAMS OF NON-PROFIT SPONSORS

The proposed limitation to 15 sites and 1500 meals on this type of sponsor would have a devastating impact on New York City.

In 1979, the New York City program served 278,600 lunches daily, in the following categories:

New York City Board of Education: 89,700 (lunches daily).
Other self-prep: 44 sponsors; 31,000 (lunches daily).
Vended programs: 62 sponsors; 157,900 (lunches daily).

In this last category, 41 sponsors would be affected by this limitation. These sponsors, which served 137,000 lunches daily in 1979, would be limited to serving only 61,500 lunches under this provision.

I'd like to point out that New York City was extremely underserved without this limitation, reaching less than one third of the eligible children.

The proposed limitation would severely limit the options for program expansion in New York City.

These are listed below with some explanation:

1. *The New York City Board of Education* is unable to absorb any costs related to this program. Because of the high fixed costs of opening a school building (costs of custodians, teachers, school food service workers, etc.) what was a break-even participation rate of 400 children (per school per day) in 1979 will become approximately 700 children per school in 1980. It is therefore unlikely that additional sites will be opened; instead the number of children at existing sites will have to be increased or these sites will be closed. Therefore, the only additional children to be reached in this option would be those who live near a school site which has already been proven successful.

2. *Other public agencies.*—In New York City, there has been no consistent involvement of public agencies, even when their participation has been actively solicited by the Administering agency. There is no reason, therefore, to expect that this situation will change substantially.

3. *Other self-prep sponors.*—Self preparation has only limited feasibility in New York City. The required facilities are virtually non-existent in many of the poorest neighborhoods. Additionally, the New York City Health Department enforces a strict restaurant-type code which makes many make-shift arrangements unable to operate. Finally, the capital-intensive nature of establishing cooking and preparation facilities presents an obstacle. Although we support the concept of self-preparation and encourage its expansion, its feasibility in terms of operation *and* administration (especially monitoring) is limited. This is especially true for large scale funding.

4. *Additional small, vended programs.*—This option presents major difficulties for administration. The last two years in New York City have provided a solid experience base from which to "weed out" those sponsors which are unable or unwilling to

operate a successful program. Those sponsors which have a proven track record have been encouraged to continue their involvement with the program.

It would be extremely unfortunate to now limit those good sponsors to a number well below their proven capacity and to weight them equally with new, inexperienced groups.

We believe that new sponsors need the most support and help and that these should be limited in size. We also believe that once a sponsor has a demonstrated capacity, limitations below that are counter-productive.

We are concerned about reaching as many as possible of those million eligible children with wholesome food in an administratively sound manner. In New York City, this job could not be done without large scale vended programs.

We urge you therefore, to support a piece of legislation which addresses all of these concerns.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

STATEMENT OF KAY STEWART, CHAIRPERSON, SUMMER MEALS ADVISORY COUNCIL, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

Mister Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, my name is Kay Stewart and I am the research coordinator of the Food Law Project of Community Action for Legal Services. I am presenting testimony today on behalf of the Summer Meals Advisory Council in New York City, of which I am chairperson. With me today are two other advisory council members: Jeanne Perry, who is staff director of the Hunger Task Force at the Community Council of Greater New York, and John Cimarosa, president of the Association for Recreation Management, an association of non-profit agency summer camps in New York City.

The Summer Meals Advisory Council was established in May, 1978 by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on the recommendation of advocates who had engaged in extensive monitoring of the program over the previous two years. Its purpose is to provide independent citizen input into USDA's administration of the Summer Food Service Program in New York City. We come to you with a set of recommendations which I will read, following which we would be pleased to elaborate on any points of interest to you or respond to questions.

Our recommendations derive from our monitoring of the Summer Food Program in New York City, which has experienced certain problems with the operation of this program not commonly found in many other areas. For this reason, some of the problems observed in New York City which have been matters of Congressional concern in recent years are not directly addressed in our legislative proposals. This is because they are being, or in our view more properly should be, handled by the agency administering the program at the state level.

The following are the council's recommendations to the Subcommittee for the reauthorization of the Summer Food Program in 1980.

1. We support language to permanently authorize the Summer Food Program to provide a more stable environment for planning and outreach.

2. We urge the Subcommittee to support a bill which will continue to require USDA to administer the program in states which are unwilling or unable to administer it themselves.

3. The amount of money available for state agency administrative expenses must be substantially increased to enable states (or USDA) to properly administer the program. In New York we have found that for the administering agency to adequately perform outreach, make approvals of sponsoring organizations, fulfill training obligations, inspect sites, etc. requires year-round administration of the program. If an across-the-board increase is not warranted, then some provision should be made to enable states which are experiencing major problems in program administration to negotiate their own administrative budgets with USDA so that they may develop appropriate management systems to improve their operations. This would also be appropriate for state administering agencies which did not run the program the previous summer.

4. We hope that the Subcommittee will weigh carefully the potential for improvements through legislative changes against the administrative disadvantages of operating the program under radically changing statutory and/or regulatory provisions year after year. The short time frame of program operations makes very difficult the implementation and adaptation of new procedures to improve program effectiveness. In New York, this problem has been compounded by the on-again, off-again administration of the program by the State Education Department and USDA, so that this is the first year that the program will be operating with something close to the same statutory and regulatory requirements and the same state administering agency for two years in a row. The USDA administrator of the New York program,

together with the advisory council, has worked out a corrective action plan including numerous innovative solutions to major problems encountered in last year's program. Such local initiative should be given an opportunity to work.

5. We strongly urge the Subcommittee members to oppose any provision which would prohibit participation by private nonprofit sponsors which contract for meals with food service management companies. The only guaranteed result of excluding sponsors of vended programs in New York City would be the sharp reduction in the number of children served by the program. There are ways to improve vended programs which could be far less expensively implemented.

6. While we support the continued existence and expansion of on-site preparation sponsorships, we think it essential that the Subcommittee recognize that increased use of school facilities and on-site preparation are not "the answer" to problems with the New York City program. For one thing, the costs of opening school buildings in New York are prohibitively high except where attendance by large numbers of children daily can be assured. For another, often the most blighted areas of the City are sorely lacking in the types of facilities that would lend themselves to on-site preparation.

For USDA or community organizations in low-income communities to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in capital expenses to obtain kitchen equipment and bring existing facilities up to health code standards for an eight-week program is hardly an efficient way to utilize funds or equipment. Even so, there is no guarantee that self-preparation facilities will provide better food at cleaner sites or will experience fewer program violations than other sites by virtue of their mode of meal preparation.

7. Administrative budgets for Summer Food Program sponsors should be negotiated with numbers of children served considered as just one of a number of factors in determining allocations. The direct connection between the sponsor's administrative budget and the number of meals served or supposedly served to children is one of the central incentives to fraud remaining in the program.

8. In our view it is time for both the Congress and USDA to re-examine the kinds of shortcomings of programs currently labeled as "violations" or "abuses"—problems such as excessive off-site consumption of meals and the presence of excess meals at the site—and recognize that in many instances such problems result from inadequate administrative control mechanisms or imperfections intrinsic to site operations, rather than from criminal intent on the part of sponsors or vendors. USDA in New York City is moving to tighten procedures to reduce the incidence of such problems. Under the current system, however, it should hardly be surprising that sponsors of non-enrolled programs cannot accurately predict the numbers of children who will show up at their sites on any given day. If anyting, USDA policies placing strict controls on approved levels of participation for sponsors have excerbated the problems and guaranteed waste in the program.

9. We note that the Summer Food Program generally runs well in summer camps, due in large part to their fixed enrollments and preparation of meals on site. We support the redefinition of camps which contract with food service management companies to prepare meals at the camp's own facility as on-site preparation sponsors. What these camps do is in all the important respects identical to hiring their own kitchen staffs. Such camps should be permitted to qualify for whatever additional administrative monies and commodities are available to other self-preparation sponsors, and should be released from the bidding requirements imposed on conventional vended program.

10. *Commodities.*—One of the best ways to provide incentives for sponsoring organizations with adequate kitchen facilities to prepare their own meals and for schools to sponsor the program or lend their facilities to interested sponsors is to provide them with greater amounts of USDA commodities. In this regard, some effort to rationalize eligibility for commodities so that the same organization is not separately applying for and receiving foods under two or three separate paragraphs of the law seems appropriate.

11. Finally, we are concerned that a preoccupation with inadequacies and supposed "abuses" in the program will lead the Congress to vote inadequate amounts of funds to reach the large numbers of children in need of summer meals. Many of the kinds of actions that need to be taken to improve program operations may not save the government money, and may actually cost more: provision of adequate state administrative monies, expansion of the amount of commodities committed to use in the program, recognition of the actual determinants of administrative costs of sponsors, etc. Innovative program ideas are still needed to identify ways of reaching children who live in urban areas so devastated that there is no acceptable site within walking distance of their homes.

The level of participation in the Summer Food Program in New York City still leaves the majority of eligible children without access to meals provided under the program. Meeting the needs of these unserved children is still the greatest challenge to those hoping to improve the Summer Food Program.

On behalf of the Summer Meals Advisory Council, I thank you for this opportunity to testify today. Members of the council will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

STATEMENT OF MARION TUCKER, CFN COORDINATOR, MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS ASSOCIATION, INC., RALEIGH, N.C.

Both migrants and seasonal farmworkers have encountered many barriers in obtaining WIC services in the past and continue to encounter them at present. Some barriers have been lessened through legislative changes in recent years. However, many other changes will be necessary if WIC eligible members of these populations are to gain initial and continuous access to WIC services.

A major conflict in serving migrant farmworkers has been the lack of a definition of the term "migrant". States have had to adopt their own definitions. With many federal, state and local agencies using various definitions for their respective programs, this policy has proved totally confusing and inadequate. Therefore, the Secretary of Agriculture should, with public input, establish a national definition for the term "migrant farmworker" for purposes of WIC program eligibility. Then, states would all use the same criteria in determining eligibility at the initial certification and at recertification. This would eliminate many problems where various states have not accepted other states' Verification of Certification cards (VOC cards) since their definitions of "migrant" have differed.

Since migrant farmworkers have not been counted in either the program funding formula or the administrative funding formula, there needs to be legislation setting forth a means of counting those WIC eligible migrant farmworkers such that funds will be available for them throughout the country. At present, a state allocation process is in effect where State Agencies request additional monies for their states if they feel any extra monies will be needed for service to migrants. In some states this method has worked, but overall, it has been inadequate. There are many reasons for the failure of the allocation system. Some of those include:

1. Uncertainty as to the numbers of migrants expected to come into the state during the year.
2. Uncertainty as to the times the migrants will be in a state during the year.
3. Changing trends in the flows of traditional migrant streams such that predictions may likely prove incorrect if flows do not follow traditional patterns.
4. Various states' peak seasons occur during all twelve months of the year. So the period in which requests for allocations are made and the subsequent period for action on those requests occurs during some states' peak seasons—which either eliminates or lessens the need for the allocations if such allocations arrive too late for use in serving the majority of the states' migrants.
5. There is no method for transferring any of the allocated monies from one state who had anticipated the need for migrant monies to another state who had not anticipated, but suddenly experiences such need. For example:
   (a) one state might traditionally have many migrants and base the allocation request upon past needs;
   (b) unanticipated event(s) (as a flood, strike, etc.) may occur, the migrants cannot work and go to another state;
   (c) that state had not anticipated their coming, and therefore, had not requested an allocation;
   (d) the migrants are in one state and the money with which to serve them is in another state;
   (e) there is no provision for getting the money where it is needed at the time of the need.
6. For whatever reason (lack of time or interest in serving migrants, etc.), many States do not request allocations for migrants.

The above-mentioned reasons for inadequacies of the current funding system indicate the need for legislation that sets forth a funding method which includes migrants. The following method for funding and service is recommended as the best means for ensuring WIC services to migrants.

1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, with public input, define "migrant farmworker" for purposes of WIC program eligibility.
2. The Secretary sets forth provisions which, for each State shall:

(a) take into account the numbers in the eligible program population of migrant farmworkers that are already in each State, those numbers projected to come into each State, the length of time such migrants will remain in the State,

(b) address the additional administrative funds required to serve migrant farmworkers.

3. Based upon the Secretary's provisions, each State agency shall set aside the State funds necessary for use in servicing and providing benefits to migrants.

4. The Secretary shall review and evaluate each State's projection of migrant needs and set aside nationally, enough funds to cover those projected needs.

5. Migrant funds, except where projected by each State as needed for use in serving migrants within that State, are subject to reallocation provided that the Secretary, in formulating any such reallocation, shall take into account any previously unanticipated changes in the flow of the migrant stream from one State to another. However, any such reallocations of migrant funds must give first consideration to migrant farmworkers. Also, if such funds should become depleted, general WIC funds should also give such priority to migrant farmworkers at the time of reallocation of funds in order that continuous service be ensured.

In each State plan of operation, the State agency shall describe how it intends to spend the funds set aside for migrant farmworkers, including the funding of local agencies that can initiate the program in areas where large numbers of migrants and seasonal farmworkers reside. This section shall give high priorities to migrant health clinics and farmworker organizations in those areas for both the establishment of local agencies and the expansion of WIC services in such areas. (It should also be noted that although local seasonal farmworkers should be counted as a part of the general population, they are often not included as such. Therefore, the establishment and expansion of clinics in areas where many seasonal farmworkers are employed and reside do need to be addressed in legislation.) In developing this portion of each State plan of operation, the State agency shall consult with migrant and seasonal farmworker organizations.

The State shall undertake, in conjunction with migrant and seasonal farmworker organizations, outreach services to areas where large numbers of migrants and seasonal farmworkers are employed and reside. The State is authorized to pay, out of the administrative funds provided, any expenses incurred by such migrant and seasonal farmworker organizations in the undertaking of outreach activities.

As the provision of nutrition education has been minimal for migrant farmworkers, legislation should also address a method for getting meaningful and continuous nutrition education to migrants. This could be accomplished through legislation which requires that:

1. nutrition education be relevant to the cultural, ethnic and language needs of WIC eligible persons,
2. a nutrition education core curriculum be developed nationally which would be used as the minimum requirement of each State agency in nutrition education,
3. a coding mechanism for such curriculum be incorporated which can be noted on VOC cards to avoid repetition in nutrition education lessons and to provide for continuity of such education for those moving from one local agency to another.

The bilingual requirements provisions should be strengthened in the legislation by requiring the Secretary to set forth specific provisions regarding the requirement for bilingual staff and bilingual materials. The provisions, as set forth by the Food Stamp Program, are recommended for use in the WIC program in regards to bilingual staffing requirements. Also, required bilingual materials should include the provision of minutes and State plans of operation in appropriate languages.

CONCLUSION

In WIC, as in any endeavor, many needed changes have become visible only after the program has been in operation over a period of time. These suggested legislative changes are recommended based upon extensive review and evaluation of WIC's past and present service to migrants and seasonal farmworkers. the outlined recommendations have been made by professionals involved with WIC service to migrants and seasonal farmworkers and by those from within the target populations. Since the recommended legislative changes come from knowledgeable sources, they cannot be overlooked if initial and continuous service to migrants and seasonal farmworkers is to be ensured.

SOCIETY FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION,
Berkeley, Calif., April 17, 1980.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: It is my pleasure to transmit to you for inclusion in the Senate Agriculture Hearings on the Nutrition Education and Training Program of the National School Lunch Act, a statement prepared by the Society for Nutrition Education.

The Society called together a group of 25 of its members who are involved in a variety of ways with the NET Program. They considered the legislation and its impact these last two years and made recommendations which formed the basis of this Statement. The Board of Directors of the Society for Nutrition Education, which represents about 5,000 professional nutritionists, reviewed their recommendations and approved them.

Therefore, we feel that this statement reflects recommendation and consensus of a large group of professionals who are directly or indirectly involved with the program. They feel that the NET Program has an impact and they urge that it be continued.

This is the same statement that was submitted to Congressman Perkins for inclusion into the House Subcommittee Hearings held March 26, 1980.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important program.

Sincerely,

HELEN D. ULLRICH,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT OF THE SOCIETY FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION

Because the Society for Nutrition Education is concerned that the nutrition section of Public Law 95-166 relating to Child Nutrition Programs be continued and strengthened, because the nutrition education component of the law has been designed to support and increase the effectiveness of Child Nutrition Programs, and because child nutrition programs can further the goal of the Society to promote the nutritional well-being of the population, the Society for Nutrition Education supports the continuation of the Nutrition Education and Training Program and recommends as priority, legislative changes in the regulations to assure the following:

1. A minimum funding at the state level of 50 cents per child plus an added inflation factor.
2. Permanent authorization for the program.
3. A provision that allows funds to be carried over from one year to the next.

The Society for Nutrition Education also recommends additional changes in the regulations so that:

1. States use a percentage of program funds for NETP publicity.
2. State plans are written at three year intervals with yearly action plans and progress reports. The needs assessment should be compiled every three years in coordination with the state plan.
3. State plans include a description of how the availability of grants and contracts will be publicized.
4. State plans are available for public comment prior to submission to the USDA.
5. State plans include a description of the composition and functioning of the State Advisory Council. Council meetings should be open and well publicized.
6. State plans include a method for involing parents in the NET Program.

SNE strongly recommends the development of a task force to study and make more effective the dissemination and distribution of materials and ideas so that wasteful duplication of effort is prevented. The Society also recommends that nutrition educators be actively involved in this task force.

The foregoing recommendations were developed in workshop task force groups by SNE members representing a variety of interests in nutrition education. The recommendations represent the group consensus of nutrition educators concerned about access to nutrition education opportunities during those stages of life in which learning is most important in establishing future behavior.

Because of the potential influence of nutrition education early in life on the development and adoption of life styles supportive of healthy people, the SNE urges your continued support of the NET Program and requests that legislation be introduced to implement this recommendation outlined above.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments for the record.

LOW INCOME PLANNING AID,
Boston, Mass., April 25, 1980.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Nutrition Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Nutrition, Washington, D.C.

The Massachusetts WIC Advisory Council Voted at its meeting on April 25, 1980 to submit testimony for the Senate Nutrition subcommittee's hearings on child nutrition. The council is deeply concerned over the funding levels proposed in the Senate by the budget committee. $848 million will mean a reduction in services to Massachusetts as the USDA has conservatively estimated an annualized rate of expenditure at the end of this fiscal year at $838 million. Massachusetts currently covers only 30 percent of its need, geographically only slightly more than 50 percent of Massachusetts WIC program, even areas that have a program are only able because of case load restrictions to serve priority 1 and 2 (pregnant women and infants), because of this lack of funding the WIC program has become a remedial program rather than the preventative one mandated by Congress.

A cut for WIC in Massachusetts will particularly hurt mothers and children because of the drastic rise in fuel and food costs in New England. Further with the threatened substantial cuts in food stamps and other child nutrition programs, WIC becomes a critical supplement to the most vulnerable members of our society. Reducing the eligibility standards to 175 percent from 195 percent will penalize the working poor in Massachusetts. The WIC program is the only child nutrition program that provides crisis relief for children and pregnant women in Massachusetts. The WIC program also refers its participants into other programs, the most important being ongoing health care. For children especially in rural areas WIC is the only agency that takes responsibility for monitoring the health of children before they reach school age.

In conclusion we say that WIC works, mothers and babies do a lot better because of this program. We have a responsibility that we can't carry out because there aren't enough funds for this State, and a cut is unthinkable. Signed Georgia Mattison, Emergency Food Services Project; Margaret Drohen, Parent Participant from Amesbury, Massachusetts; Beth Brewer, Parent Participant from Chickopee; Esther Splaine, Parent Participant from Cambridge; Joan McGauley, WIC Coordinator Worchester, Massachusetts; Arlene Thomson, WIC Nutritionist Greenfield, Massachusetts; Jack Giarusso, Massachusetts Cap Directors Association; Rita Belanger, Parent Participant Fall River, Massachusetts; Debbie Ortlip, Project Good Health, Roxbury, Massachusetts; Erma Levine, Visiting Nurses Association; Florence Mackie, Massachusetts Nutrition Board.

STATEMENT OF SHERI DISALVO, DIRECTOR, FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICES, MILPITAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, MILPITAS, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman, member of the subcommittee: I am Sheri DiSalvo, Director of Food and Nutrition Services, Milpitas Unified School District, Milpitas, California. I appreciate this opportunity to present this testimony on behalf of the children who participate in Nutrition Education and Training Programs.

There is an urgent need for the Child Nutrition Program funding to be maintained at its present level. A cut in funding would drastically alter the operation of all Child Nutrition Programs including Nutrition Education.

My purpose today is to share with you the experience we have had in the development of a California Exemplary Model Nutrition Education Program.

We view Nutrition Education as a natural outgrowth of our food service department. We recognize that a food service program can and should make a significant contribution to the total educational process. We have the expertise, the facilities and the personnel to provide an outstanding support service to our school district.

The food service program provides a unique resource for the local community and the nation. The goal of school food service is to provide quality meals that foster the development of strong bodies and healthy minds, while maintaining a cost/effective program that is self-supporting.

However, what good does it do to provide quality meals that are not eaten by the student? How can you run a cost/effective program if participation is low? How can you build participation?

Our project results show that nutrition education provides the answer to these questions. A nutrition program does increase the student's willingness to consume whole grain breads, cereals, fresh fruits and vegetables. Participation increased in both the breakfast and lunch program in the schools where nutrition education programs have been implemented. We have gathered some preliminary data that indicates a longitudinal effect in increased participation at the junior high school where students who attened the project school are now enrolled.

Nutrition education reflects our commitment to students. In our project "Teaming for Nutrition Education", we are currently involved in 9 elementary schools serving 3,400 students. In one 2½ month period 378 nutrition education classroom activities occurred. We have conducted inservice for 107 teachers in conjunction with the California University System.

Our nutrition education curriculum has been designed to provide maximum student involvement in the learning process. We have been pleased to see the philosophical approach we use in nutrition education influencing the educational processes and procedures being used in other curriculum development in the district. One outcome of nutrition education lies in the affective domain. Students are affirmed through experiences in preparing and tasting foods.

Three of the strengths our nutrition education curriculum are: (1) the reinforcement of basic skills inherent in the activities; (2) the interdisciplinary content of the lessons; (3) and the multicultural studies that are included.

Nutrition education has provided the opportunity for food services personnel to grow professionally. We are the first project to use the food service manager in the classroom and to assess the effect of this involvement. When the food service manager goes into the classroom to support "hands on" activities with the food, their relationship with teachers, parents, and students reflect this expanded role. This rapport begins in the classroom and extends into the cafeteria. Apricots can serve as an example of this relationship between classroom and cafeteria. Apricots are often served in our school food service program since their vitamin A content helps meet the nutritional requirements of the lunch pattern. Without nutrition education, serving apricots is an exercise in futility—dish them up, serve them, scrape them off the plates.

In our multicultural studies, we prepared crepes as an example of an international bread product. Apricots were selected for filling the crepes because of their unacceptability in school lunch. In classrooms, students made crepes with apricot filling. At the conclusion of the classroom activities we served apricots in the cafeteria. For the first time students ate them.

The food service manager was able to inteact with the students on the basis of their mutual classroom experiences with apricots.

We've found that nutrition education helps our students eat cornbread and greens, accept low fat milk, and think carrots taste good. After making applesauce in kindergarten, twenty-five students left a total of one-half ounce of applesauce on their plates. In our latest food consumption survey, we found an overall waste decrease of 24 percent of the fruit served.

Part of the impact of nutrition education is the recognition of the food service manager as a knowledgable resource person. Nutrition education has provided the manager with an excellent opportunity to help educators understand the nutritional content of school meal patterns. When concerns are expressed about serving so called "junk food" like pizza in the food service program, the manager can correct misconceptions about carbohydrates or the caloric value of school meals.

Our food service personnel attend college classes to increase their knowledge and skills. Our department is philosphically committed to employees projecting the image of people who practice healthful food habits.

Nutrition education provides parents with an opportunity to be involved in the health of their children through classroom activities. We use this involvement when working with advisory committees to select nutritious snacks for special occasions in the classroom.

One outcome of nutrition education has been to establish a Board of Education policy that bans the sale of foods with minimum nutrient value to students during the school day.

The support we have received from Gene White and her Nutrition Education and Training Program Staff in the Child Nutrition Programs, California State Department of Education, has played an important role in motivating us towards success.

The leadership of our Board of Education and central staff in our district has been vital to our program.

However, the major ingredient to the success of our programs is the hard work and dedication of the entire staff. We work as a team in an atmosphere of cooperation. Together we have built a department that produces a product of greater quality than any one individual could produce.

We've been asked, "Why does your school food service get involved in so many different programs, including nutrition education? The answer is—We are morally committed to children.

In order to continue the nutrition education programs, at its current level, Federal funding is necessary. Our goal is to institutionalize nutrition education by making it an integral part of the curriculum in all elementary schools. We need a financially secure period of time to develop quality programs and establish a national communication network.

We ask for your support for the current level of funding for child nutrition programs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

STATEMENT OF VICKY KATAYAMA, FOOD LAW CENTER, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Dear Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I would like to thank the committee for holding this hearing on the Summer Food Program (SFP) and for permitting groups like ours to present our experiences to you first hand.

I am a food program specialist with the Food Law Center. I have worked closely with the SFP for four and one-half years. My role as a food program specialist is to improve and expand federally funded food programs so that more needy children can be fed nutritious meals. I have also been appointed by Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland to serve on the congressionally mandated Advisory Council on Child Nutrition.

Over the four and one-half years that I have worked with SFP, it has gone through many changes. Most of us still remember the reported scandals of 1976 which have continued to scar the SFP to this day. Despite the fact that since 1976 there has been more controlled legislation passed, tighter regulations written, increased use of statistical sampling as an audit tool, increased monitoring by State and USDA Regional Offices (RO), and improved program performance the children and program still suffer. Instead the Administration is playing on past problems of this weak program in order to justify making program cuts.

It is my hope to be able to present the facts that show you that the Summer Food Program is fiscally and administratively accountable and should not be used as a scapegoat for budget cuts as is presently occurring.

THE MYTH OF PRESENT UNACCOUNTABILITY

In 1976 the SFP acquired the reputation of being a problem-ridden program. Some of the problems were: untimely issuance of regulations and other program material, lack of state assistance and monitoring, site overlap, sponsor recordkeeping, meals being taken off site, over ordering of meals, and food vendor ripoffs.

Now let's look at what has been done to correct these problems since 1976. Public Law 95-106 was passed and made the following changes:

(1) eliminated all "seriously deficient" sponsors;
(2) required on-going, year round service to the community;
(3) set up a priority system to avoid site overlap;
(4) reduced the number of meals (snacks included) a sponsor can serve from five to three;
(5) required sponsors to submit administrative budgets subject to approval by the state;
(6) required food vendors to register with the state;
(7) established a standard form of contract for use by sponsors and vendors;
(8) required food vendors to acquire a bid and performance bond;
(9) established a penalty for fraud.

Additionally, federal regulations further required (1) states to audit all sponsors (with the exception of those receiving over $50,000 who are required to hire their own auditor) once every two years; (2) provide for a state option for statistical monitoring; and (3) specify the number of sponsors a state must visit with specific time lines for these visits. Another change you will notice is the lack of need to drastically alter the federal regulations this past year—indicating a stabilizing period in the program.

I feel the results of these changes in the program are shown when we look at California's 1979 Audit Report from the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The use of statistical monitoring (which is contested by many as being unreflective of program participation) was applied to 58 Los Angeles sponsors feeding 150,437 children at 785 sites. This report shows that only 10 percent of the lunches were over claimed and that 6.5 percent of these were at six of 95 sites.

USDA ADMINISTRATION

In November 1978 our State Department of Education (SDE) agreed once again to administer the SFP. However, in March 1979, SED suddenly decided not to administer the program for the Summer of 1979. This gave USDA's Regional Office (RO) only two months to "gear up." Despite the short, seemingly impossible preparation time, our RO not only served more children than the year before (1978: 169,000; 1979: 190,000) but they also used only $640,000 of the authorized $679,000 to administer the program. This year the RO has already done one to one outreach in the community and as a result 169 new potential sponsors are applying.

In addition if we look at the 1978 OIG Audit Report of the state agency we will see, "State Agency (SA) Administration of the 1978 Summer Food Service Program did not show any visible improvement over the 1977 performance, and in some cases appeared less effective. We were unable to determine whether there were any weaknesses in program planning this year, but the deficiencies we noticed in operation were indicative of poor state wide management."

Where USDA administers the SFP, it does so for various reasons. Among them being that: (i) the state has enacted legislation prohibiting administration of the SFP; (ii) it is not economically feasible for the state because too few children are served; or (iii) the state is of the belief that its Department of Education is there to educate, not feed, children. USDA has been attempting to eliminate RO administration of the SFP and any administrative funds. If they are successful, there is a possibility that 21 states will be without programs. California and New York being two of the 21 RO administered states serve almost one-third of our nation's children. Therefore, we support one of the legislative recommendations of the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition—that the RO's be allowed to continue to administer the SFP in those states that can't or choose not to and that money continue to be appropriated for this administration.

SCHOOLS—THE FAVOURED SON

USDA has continued to push for legislation and regulation to give priority to schools in the sponsorship of the SFP. The concept sounds good, but it has some major flaws:

(1) Schools have been notified for years about the availability of the program but most of them don't want the program.

(2) In California, Proposition 13 has closed down summer schools with few exceptions. Now we have the additional threat of Proposition 9 or Jarvis II.

(3) Community groups offer various programs, that is, recreational, cultural and educational along with the food service in a child's own neighborhood.

(4) Schools are far and few between in rural areas.

To shed some more factual light on this matter, I would like to share some interesting statistics from the 1979 OIG Audit Report. Of the 10 percent of ineligible lunches reported, over 5 percent were from school sponsored programs.

ELIMINATION OF LARGE VENDED PROGRAMS

In California (as in most states) in order to reach children during the summer months, it is necessary to go to the community agencies, not the schools. This is especially true with the Proposition 13 cutbacks. Even before Proposition 13 relatively few schools participated in the SFP, mainly because it was not financially profitable for them. Therefore, the responsibility was taken up by community agencies. Much like the schools, community agencies cannot afford to go into debt to operate the Summer Food Program. The more children served, the less likely that debt will be incurred. In the same fashion that most schools do not sponsor a SFP, most do not act as vendors for community agencies, so into this void enters the profit making food vendor. Approximately 65 percent of Northern California's children and at least 30 percent of Southern California's children are served by sponsors using profit making vendors.

SUMMARY

The Senate Agriculture Committee and House Education Committee have both recently voted to recommend to the Budget Committee USDA's suggested cut of 44.6 million dollars to the SFP or almost one-third of the program's budget. This move was successful because of the program's past reputation.

In order to justly serve the children in our nation, we need to:

(1) realize that the administration of the SFP has improved significantly and is now accountable;

(2) we must continue to allow RO administration of the program;

(3) we must give first priority to any sponsor, private or public, with a good past record of program performance;

(4) we must not eliminate large vended programs with a good track record.

Thanks to you members of Congress this program exists to serve hungry children in the Summer when they might otherwise go without a balanced meal. It is a program that has had its problems, but if you take a closer look I think you will find it is now a program that has worked through many of the growing pains and is starting to mature.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Sacramento, Calif., April 10, 1980.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Nutrition of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: I understand that your subcommittee is holding hearings on the Nutrition Education and Training Program on April 15, 1980. I am forwarding to you the written testimony of Amanda Dew Mellinger, Coordinator of California's Nutrition Education and Training Program. This testimony represents the position of the California State Department of Education on the Nutrition Education and Training Program. I request that Ms. Mellinger's testimony be made a part of the official record of the hearings.

I know that you are particularly interested in food service involvement in the NET Program. In California, food service involvement in the local nutrition education projects has been a major emphasis this year.

Because of this emphasis, education and food service personnel have begun working together in support of the nutrition education programs in their schools. We see evidence of menu changes, occurring because of food service involvement in the local projects. These changes reflect an increase in use of nutritious foods and an overall improvement in the quality of meals served.

We are actively pursuing the development and implementation of courses for school food service personnel at the community college and university levels. During spring and summer semesters of 1980 two courses of study are being offered for credit at thirty-three community colleges and seven universities: "Current Issues in Child Nutrition Programs" and "Food Procurement for Child Nutrition Programs". Approximately 1,300 persons are expected to enroll. The courses were developed with input from educators and practitioners and they are designed for school food service managers, prospective managers, child care administrators, and directors or supervisors of school food service. Information is presented on current nutrition issues, program operations, children's food habits, role of food service managers in nutrition education, decision making procedures, law as it affects food procurement, product selection, receiving, and ethics. A process method of instruction is used in conducting the program for optimum retention and application of the information. A cadre of trainers have been instructed in the use of materials and in the teaching strategy, along with background information on the child nutrition programs. Since both courses are new and have not been offered to child care and food service personnel previously, the instructors have been requested to evaluate the courses as well as to administer pre and post tests to the participants. By mid summer we will have information on how the two Food Service Management Courses have influenced a number of factors including menu planning, that is, has the sugar and fat content of the meals been reduced as a result of participating in the courses? Additional courses and activities are being planned for 1980-81.

Nutrition Education has made giant strides in California. Public awareness and support is growing. Children, teachers, and parents are developing the knowledge to make wise food choices, and food service personnel are being given the opportunity to increase their knowledge and skills to improve the overall quality of meals served to children. This is just the beginning. We seek your support for reauthorization of the NET Program for a minimum of four years with the funding level set at a minimum of 50 cents per year.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

L. GENE WHITE,
Director,
Office of Child Nutrition Services.

Enclosure.

STATEMENT OF AMANDA DEW MELLINGER, COORDINATOR, NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee: I am Amanda Dew Mellinger, Coordinator of the Nutrition Education and Training Program, Office of Child Nutrition Services, California State Department of Education. I appreciate the opportunity to submit testimony to your Committee on behalf of the children, parents, teachers, school administrators, and food service personnel participating in California's Nutrition Education and Training Program.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of all the people I represent today, I want to express appreciation to you and this Committee for the leadership and support which you have given to nutrition and nutrition education over the years.

Today, I will be sharing with you the story of California's NET Program. I will also be expressing the concerns and needs that the people I represent have for the NET Program nationally. In particular, we are asking that you support reauthorization of the Program for at least four years with the funding level set at a minimum of 50 cents per child per year.

Nutrition education began in California schools in 1975 when the State legislature appropriated funds for local nutrition education projects. Through the small beginnings of our State program, the commitment to nutrition education existed in California prior to the passage of Public Law 95-166. This commitment provided a solid base of support for the goals in Public Law 95-166 of teaching children about nutrition and its relationship to good health, training food service personnel in the principles and practices of food service management, instructing teachers in sound principles of nutrition education, and developing and using classroom materials and curricula. With this support, the Federal funding made available through Public Law 95-166 made it possible to develop a statewide program in California.

California's Program has four major components which address the goals established in Public Law 95-166:

(1) Local projects, whose objective is to support innovative and creative local agency nutrition education programs. These programs teach children about nutrition, train food service personnel and teachers, develop materials and educate parents and the community.

(2) Staff development community education, whose objective is to develop and implement training programs for food service and child care personnel and teachers.

(3) Curriculum development, whose objective is to develop and implement nutrition education curriculum, preschool through grades twelve, that coordinates instructional and food service programs and can be integrated into existing core curriculum.

(4) Public awareness, whose objective is to develop and implement a media package which focuses on the need for nutrition education. It is intended, also, to motivate action for improved dietary practices in the home, school, and community.

Within these components, we have accomplished the following major activities:

(1) Funded and provided training and guidance to 150 local projects in public schools, county offices of education, private non-profit agencies, county health departments and colleges/universities. These projects serve not only the needs of preschoolers and elementary and secondary students, but also special populations such as pregnant teenagers, migrants, and the handicapped. Six of the original State funded projects are serving as "model" programs and are disseminating their programs statewide to fifty so-called "adoption" agencies.

(2) Developed the training program for school food service and child care personnel.

(3) Developed the full nutrition education curriculum.

We feel these are significant accomplishments in a very short time span. But you will note that much of the work up to now has been developmental. Except for the on-going local project activity, we are just moving into the implementation stage of the Program. We are, therefore, very concerned about where the Program goes from here. We believe the Program should be extended for at least four years and the authorized funding level should be set at a minimum of 50 cents per child per year to assure the achievement of the goals set out in the law. We ask, also, that the Committee consider raising the minimum authorized grant amount of $75,000 to assist the smaller states to better meet their goals.

We feel there is no need for major changes in the law because we believe it is sound in concept and working in practice. Our beliefs are based on our evaluation covering 1978-79 which shows that NET, through the local projects, is: (1) helping children develop good food habits. Their attitudes toward good nutrition improved by 11 percent. And, their food choices improved by 15 percent, (2) reducing plate waste and, thus, cutting the cost of school meals. Overall plate waste in project schools decreased by 26 percent. For example, milk waste decreased 31 percent, vegetable waste decreased 24 percent and salad waste decreased 33 percent, and (3) integrating the school meal programs with the total educational experience. In fact, we see instructional and food service personnel working together, many for the first time, to make the local projects more successful.

We in NET have another real concern: the current and future appropriation levels for the Program. There seems to be an attempt to "chip away" at the solid base of the Program through limitations in the actual funding of it. After starting out fully funded at $26,000,000 per year, or 50 cents per child, for fiscal years 1978 and 1979, USDA asked and got $20,000,000, or 39 cents per child, for fiscal year 1980. The Department is now asking for only $15,000,000, or 29 cents per child, for fiscal year 1981.

To assure understanding of the basis for our concern and the potential adverse effects of this further reduction, let me briefly trace the fiscal history of the NET Program in California. As you know, Public Law 95-166 became law in November 1977. The State Plan for fiscal year 1978 was submitted, per USDA's timeline, in September 1978. When the fiscal year 1978 funds were released upon approval of the State Plan, we were finally able to hire staff—a process that was not completed until January 1979. One of the first activities for the staff was to prepare an amendment to the 1978 State Plan to receive fiscal year 1979 funding. Thus, it was not until July 1979 that California had received its total allocation for both fiscal years 1978 and 1979. Because of these built-in time lags, we ended up with a bulge in funding in the last quarter of fiscal year 1979. USDA had allowed a carry over of funds for fiscal year 1978 into fiscal year 1979 and then budgeted only $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1980. We did not feel this reduction was good for the Program but did not severely quarrel with the allocation because we believed we could carry over fiscal year 1979 funds into 1980. However, we were not allowed to carry over these funds.

We are now facing a budgetary "crunch" during fiscal year 1981 if the appropriation is at the level requested by USDA. USDA is basing its rationale for the additional $5,000,000 cut—which is actually over $11,000,000 below the authorized amount—on "the large amount of unspent funds in prior year accounts." I can assure you that California and the other States have no "hoard" of unspent money from fiscal years 1978 and 1979 to redirect into fiscal year 1980 and 1981 activities. All of these funds are committed for use in fulfilling the objectives set forth in our 1978 and 1979 State Plans. In fact, USDA recognizes that these funds are committed by stating in their budget message: "Of the $52.4 million made available * * * in fiscal years 1978 and 1979, about $49.6 million was obligated (i.e., committed) as of November 30, 1979." But they go on to say that almost half of this total remains unspent in the States' letters of credit. Although the expenditure reports used by USDA in its evaluation may appear to show "unspent" funds, they are, in fact, reflecting the grindingly slow nature of State and Federal accounting and reporting systems rather than any "hoarding" of money by the States.

After all of the rhetoric is stripped away, the fact remains that all funding in the letters of credit through the end of fiscal year 1980 will be committed to and eventually spent on activities covered by the first three State Plans.

We are now developing our State Plan and budget estimates for fiscal year 1981. It is clear from our work that we must have the fully authorized amount of 50 cents per child or there will be severe cutbacks in Program services for 1981.

There have been expectations raised as a result of the course which this Program has taken. In the case of California, we have been through an extensive developmental phase during which broad participation was solicited from all of our NET "publics". As a result of this process, we have many innovative and creative products to disseminate and, therefore, we are ready to move into the real implementation phase of NET in 1981. However, this phase will be severely hampered by the reduction in funds proposed by USDA. In California, we will have to reduce the number of local projects from 150 to less than 50. We will only be able to provide training in use of the curriculum to less than half of the agencies requesting it. We will not be able to pay training costs of school food service personnel for courses already developed and no new courses will be developed. And, we will have to curtail the media campaign and completely omit the parent and community education component of our Program.

I hope the Committee shares my concern that NET not repeat the sad history of some other federally funded programs where full funding has gone in for a short period of time, work has been done and expectations raised, and then, as a result of curtailed or reduced funding, valuable products and services have not gotten to the people who needed them, and, thus were wasted.

In closing, let me say that we in the NET Program realize that this is a critical time in our country—a time to examine all costs of government and to practice sufficient fiscal restraint to help bring inflation under control. However, I ask that you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this committee consider not only the demonstrated success of this Program so far, but the potential savings it offers in the costs of the other child nutrition programs, in health care, and in education generally. Certainly, there is common agreement that a well-nourished child is a better learner and, thus, each dollar spent for educating this child has greater impact.

We ask, also, that you consider that this Program is still in its infancy. We have developed many innovative approaches to make nutrition education a part of every child's daily educational experience. We know that education is an on-going process and that nutrition education, to be effective, must be a continuing part of this process. Congress charted the course for reaching this objective with the passage of Public Law 95-166. We in NET must have the time and resouces to complete the course that was charted. We ask that you continue your leadership in this vital area by supporting reauthorization of the Program for at least four years, and setting the funding level at a minimum of 50 cents per child per year with special consideration being given to the minimum grant amount for small States. We ask, also, your help in assuring that, in Fiscal Year 1981 and beyond, the full funding level is made available through the appropriation process.

Those of us who are implementing the NET Program at the State and local levels are committed to the Program, and will do our best to deliver the highest quality nutrition education for the well-being of our nation's children.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The National Education Association, representing over 1.8 million educators throughout the nation, appreciates the opportunity to submit this statement on child nutrition programs to this Subcommittee.

Educators are deeply concerned with the health and overall care of our school-aged children. It is a well known fact that children concentrate, study, and perform better in class if they receive adequate and nourishing meals. Teachers see this every day.

The initiation and extension of the child nutrition programs recognized that vital and crucial relationship between learning and hunger. Because of this known nexus, the NEA has difficulty fathoming the rationale proffered for the proposed half billion dollar cuts in these programs.

The proposed Section 4 cuts will drastically affect the school lunch program. By decreasing the current rate of federal reimbursement for the paying child by five cents, one-third of the federal support for these children will be terminated.

Section 4 funds also serve as the basis for state matching funds. Consequently, a reduction in federal monies results in a decrease at the state level. The domino theory applies here because a decrease at the federal level will affect the state allocation. Further, the local support will dwindle. The proposed cut will eviscerate the program and eliminate many children who rely on it for their only nutritious meal of the day.

It is estimated that this cut will save the government over $140 million. That five cent increase, it is claimed, can easily be assumed by those families of paying children. This is simplistic thinking. The majority of the paying children belong to families whose income levels are extremely close to the reduced price cut-off line. To assume easy absorption of that additional cost by those already struggling families is unrealistic. The current state of the economy and the rising inflation rate are quite enough with which to contend. Every penny is committed. Add another pressure/burden to that family budget and you will see more than the projected 600,000 children withdrawing from the program.

To save approximately another $180 million, it is suggested that the eligibility requirements for free school meals be lowered from 125 percent of the poverty level to 100 percent. For reduced price meals, it is proposed that the current 195 percent of the poverty level requirement be decreased to 175 percent.

The USDA conservatively estimates substantial drops in the participation by all groups. A million-plus children will be affected. That implies that over a million children will be deprived of adequate nourishment daily. It further implies that a million-plus children around this country will be unable to function at their potential in the classroom simply because the program no longer addresses their needs.

The rationale behind these "savings" fails to recognize what impact reduced participation in the programs will produce on the overall economy. It is obvious that a reduction in the total number of meals served/children fed will result in a corresponding reduction in the total number of employees required to prepare, serve, and clean up after meals. Moreover, the majority of the employees whose jobs would be affected are themselves from lower income families, with children. The cycle continues.

The priorities of the nation must be evaluated. A balanced budget is desirable, and it appears inevitable at present. But this country has recorded its commitment to the poor, to the children who need at least one balanced meal per day. The proposed cuts in these most crucial programs will clearly indicate the government's abandonment of the concept of equity and humanity for our people. The NEA urges reconsideration of the proposed cuts.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1980.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Nutrition, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your letter of April 23, 1980. We have responded to all the questions you listed in your letter in the "Q and A" format for easier review. These responses are enclosed with each question addressed individually.

We appreciate your continued interest and strong support of our Special Nutrition Programs.

Sincerely,

CAROL TUCKER FOREMAN,
Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services.

[Questions submitted by Senator McGovern to Secretary Foreman and answers thereto:]

Question. What is USDA doing to implement the Dietary Guidelines in the context of the Child Nutrition Programs?

Answer. The following actions have been taken or proposed by FNS:

(A) A recommendation has been inserted into regulations for the NSLP to moderate sugar, salt and fat in school feeding programs. Guidance materials have been developed and distributed to States and schools in preliminary form. They are now being incorporated into the revision of the "Menu Planning Guide for School Food Service" which is to be issued in June 1980.

(B) The maximum level of fat in USDA ground beef and pork purchases has been reduced (minimum 14 percent, maximum 24 percent). In 1980, beef purchases have been reduced by 25 percent and pork and chicken are being substituted. The standard for fat in USDA purchased ground pork is the same as that in beef.

(C) Canned fruits have been purchased in light and natural syrups. All purchases for schools are now in light syrup.

(D) Plans have been finalized to test reduced salt levels in canned vegetables for use in the elderly feeding program and schools. The Nutrition and Technical Services Division is conducting preliminary tests in Fairfax County Schools, Virginia, in May 1980, and is proceeding with the development of a contract to conduct more extensive tests in the 1980/81 school year.

(E) Regulations now require schools to serve unflavored lowfat milk, skim milk or buttermilk. This regulatory change became final in August 1979, but schools were not required to renegotiate contracts signed for the 1979-80 school year.

(F) Regulations have been finalized to limit the sale of foods of minimal nutritional value. The competitive foods regulation is scheduled to go into effect in July 1980.

(G) Commodity purchases have been modified to eliminate salt on peanuts for the school lunch program and to lower salt in canned meats.

Question. Both you and Mr. Greenstein have frequently stated that every WIC evaluation to date, using cereal fortified to 45 percent of the U.S. RDA for iron, is improving the health of participants. If one of the basic nutritional purposes of the WIC program is to lower the incidence of iron deficiency anemia, and if cereal is the primary contributor of iron in the WIC food package, doesn't lowering the iron requirement risk the success of the program?

Answer. Several studies which have been performed to evaluate the effectiveness of the WIC program including a medical evaluation performed by the University of North Carolina, a study performed on WIC participants in Massachusetts, reports from State and local WIC agencies and an analysis of data collected through the Center for Disease Control's Nutrition Surveillance System indicate improvement in iron nutrition with participation in WIC. The Department does not want to jeopardize the success of the WIC program in positively affecting iron nutrition. However, a lower iron requirement for cereals would not necessarily diminish the effectiveness of the WIC program. In assessing the adequacy of dietary iron it is important to consider not only total iron intake, but more importantly, the amount of iron which is absorbed. Data available to the Department indicates that forms of iron used to fortify some cereals fortified at 25 percent of the USRDA for iron may be better absorbed than forms of iron used to fortify some cereals fortified at or above 45 percent of the USRDA for iron. Furthermore, the Department is concerned about the low acceptability of currently authorized cereals by participants. Data available from a report on WIC program delivery systems, small scale surveys and interviews with participants indicate that the acceptability of cereals currently authorized in WIC is not as high as it should be to ensure participants receive maximum benefits from the WIC food package.

Question. Since there has been no change in the USRDA for iron and since the WIC population continues to be the segment of society most vulnerable to iron deficiency anemia, what motivates FNS to propose a dual iron standard?

Answer. Participants in the WIC Program are certified as being at nutritional risk for a number of reasons; iron deficiency is only one nutritional risk criteria used in certification. Although the Department does not have data to indicate that participants who are not iron deficient are consuming foods high in iron, it would be reasonable to assume that they either have sufficient iron stores to protect against iron deficiency or are obtaining a sufficient amount of iron through their diets or in a medicinal form. In view of the fact that available data indicates poor acceptability of currently authorized cereals, the Department determined that for participants who are not iron deficient acceptability of cereals outweighs the need for cereals which contain a large amount of iron and proposed that these participants be able to receive cereals which contain a minimum of 25 percent of the USRDA for iron.

Acceptability of cereals is also important for participants who are iron deficient. However, because cereals are the primary source of iron in the food packages for women and children participants, the Department determined that for participants who are iron deficient, the need for cereals which contain a large amount of iron outweighs the acceptability of cereals and proposed that these participants be limited to receiving cereals which contain a minimum of 45 percent of the USRDA for iron.

The Department is now carefully reviewing this issue in light of the many comments received on it.

Question. What are the medical facts supporting the case for 25 percent-iron cereals? Is medical opinion strongly on your side? For example, do the physicians previously, or presently, serving on your various advisory panels support this position of diluting the iron standard?

Answer. The Department has received input from physicians on reducing of the iron requirement for cereals authorized in the WIC Program. The recommendations have not been completely consistent. The food package advisory panel, which included a physician, recommended that the iron requirement for cereals be decreased to 25 percent of the USRDA for iron. Physicians contacted prior to issuance of the proposed regulations varied in their opinions, some recommended that the iron requirement be maintained at 45 percent of the USRDA for iron and others offered a compromise position of allowing cereals fortified at 45 percent of the USRDA with sources of iron which have good bioavailability until 18 months of age and allowing cereals fortified at 25 percent of the USRDA for iron after this time. Physicians who commented on the proposed WIC food package regulations also varied in their opinions.

Question. If cereal variety is being sought, let me ask this question: how many cold cereals are eligible for distribution under the current regulation and how many cereals would be available under the proposed regulation? Has the number of cereals fortified to the 45 percent level increased over the past few years?

Answer. Under the current regulations which require that cereals contain minimum of 45 percent of the USRDA for iron, thirteen cold cereals are authorized for distribution. (There are seven hot cereals which are also authorized). However, two of the cold cereals currently authorized contain more sugar than the proposal would allow. Also, information from WIC State agencies indicate that many of these cereals have limited availability and two of these cereals are available in fewer than five States. Under the proposed regulations which lower the iron requirement for cereals provided to non-iron deficient participants to 25 percent of the USRDA for iron and impose a sugar limit of six grams of sugar per ounce, twenty-five cold cereals would be authorized for these participants. (There are four hot cereals which also would be authorized). Attached is a chart which lists cereals which meet the sugar limit and contain a minimum of 45 percent of the USRDA for iron and 25 percent of the USRDA for iron.

The number of cereals fortified to 45 percent or more of the USRDA for iron has increased by four in about two years, but two are being test-marketed and are not available nationwide.

CEREALS WITH A MINIMUM OF 45 PERCENT USRDA FOR IRON AND LESS THAN 20 PERCENT SUGAR

Cereal	Manufacturer	Iron content (percent USRDA)	Sugar content (gr/oz)	Marketing availability	Cost per 1 oz serving	Box size (oz)	Box cost
1. Product 19	Kelloggs	100	3	Nationwide	$0.11	12	$1.29
2. Most	Kelloggs	100	6	Nationwide	.09	12	1.05
3. Smart Start	Kelloggs	100	4	3 States only	N/A		
4. Total	General Mills	100	3	Nationwide	.11	12	1.33
5. Corn Total	General Mills	100	3	Limited	N/A		
6. Concentrate	Kelloggs	50	3	Limited	.23	6	1.39
7. Buc Wheats	General Mills	50	5	Nationwide	.11	10	1.09
8. Kaboom	General Mills	45	6	Limited	N/A		
9. Fortified Oat Flakes	Post	45	6	Limited	.10	12	1.19
10. Country Corn Flakes	General Mills	45	3	Very limited	N/A		
11. Kix	General Mills	45	2	Nationwide	.11	9	.99
12. Quick Malto-Meal	Malt-o-Meal	45	0	Very limited	N/A		
13. Chocolate Malto-Meal	Malt-o-Meal	45	0	Very limited	N/A		
14. Cream of Wheat, Quick	Nabisco	45	0	Nationwide	.05	14	.65
15. Cream of Wheat, Instant	Nabisco	45	0	Nationwide	.04	28	1.15

N/A—not available in D.C. area stores to obtain price.
Nationwide—available in all 60 State agencies surveyed.
Limited—unavailable in more than 10 State agencies.
Very limited—unavailable in more than 20 State agencies.

CEREALS WITH 25 PERCENT USRDA FOR IRON AND LESS THAN 20 PERCENT SUGAR

Cereal	Manufacturer	Iron content (percent USRDA)	Sugar content (gr/oz)	Cost per 1 oz serving	Box size (oz)	Box cost
1. Cheerios	General Mills	25	1	$0.07	15	$0.99
2. Wheat Chex	Ralston	25	2	.05	15	.79
3. Special K	Kelloggs	25	3	.12	11	1.29
4. Wheaties	General Mills	25	3	.08	12	.95
5. Grapenut Flakes	Post	25	4	.09	12	1.05
6. 40% Bran Flakes	Post	25	5	.07	16	1.13
7. Life	Quaker	25	5	.09	15	1.29
8. Bran Chex	Ralston	25	5	.06	14	.79
9. Cinnamon Life	Quaker	25	6	.09	15	1.29
10. All Bran	Kelloggs	25	5	.07	16	1.09
11. Puffed Wheat	Maltomeal	25	1	N/A		
12. Puffed Rice	Maltomeal	25	1	N/A		
13. ToastieO's	Maltomeal	25	1	N/A		

N/A—Not available

Question. The iron deficiency criterion, "exhibit signs of anemia", strikes me as being a rather nebulous one. With respect to certification of iron deficiency, given the apparently inconclusive nature of hemoglobin and/or hematocrit blood tests, why should participants failing to "exhibit signs of anemia" be certified as not anemic without benefit of additional blood test such as those described by WIC medical evaluators?

Answer. The current WIC program regulations require a hematological test for anemia as a part of certification. However, no specific test is required; the Department does not limit the test to a hemoglobin or a hematocrit determination. However, in a clinic setting these are the most commonly used measures of iron nutrition. In comparison to other hematologic tests, both are regarded as being simple, fast, reliable, readily available and inexpensive methods of assessing iron nutrition.

Although more sensitive and specific measures of iron nutrition are allowed to be used in certification for WIC, they are more costly and require specialized equipment to perform. Additionally, the level of expertise necessary to perform the tests may require contracting with private laboratories.

The certification criteria for WIC included in the regulations do not specify the exact types of tests to be used or the levels to establish anemia or other nutritional risk conditions. State and local agencies set their own certification standards within the broad criteria stated in the program regulations.

Question. This brings up another question: If, in fact, a large percentage of WIC participants are enrolled who do not "exhibit signs of anemia", how effective is the program's outreach effort; in other words, are these the people most needy?

Answer. Assessment of nutritional status usually includes evaluation of clinical, biochemical, anthropometric and dietary data. WIC program regulations include these indicators as well as nutritionally related medical conditions, poor obstetric history and conditions which predispose persons to inadequate nutritional patterns in the list of criteria which can be used to determine eligibility for the WIC program. However, in order to ensure that those persons at greatest nutritional risk receive program benefits, the regulations include a priority system to be applied by the competent professional authority. Pregnant women, breastfeeding women and infants who exhibit signs of anemia by hematologic measurements are included in priority I; children who exhibit signs of anemia by hematologic measurements are included in priority III; and non-breastfeeding postpartum women who exhibit signs of anemia by hematologic measurements are included in priority VI. Therefore, the fact that many WIC participants do not exhibit signs of anemia does not indicate that the program's outreach effort is not effective.

O